

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

EDWIN GREENLAW

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

W. KURRELMAYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

VOLUME XLI

1926

---

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE .

TO THE MEMORY OF  
JAMES WILSON BRIGHT  
1852-1926

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDITORS OF  
MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, 1886-1915  
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, 1916-1925



## JAMES WILSON BRIGHT

1852-1926

The editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES dedicate this volume to the memory of JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, the late editor-in-chief. The retirement of Professor Bright marks the end of an era. When he came to the Johns Hopkins University, in 1879, as a young graduate student, he found graduate study and research still in its beginnings in America. The university to which he came, the *alma mater* of American graduate schools, had been open for only three years, and more than a decade was destined still to elapse before the establishment of the Harvard Graduate School and the opening of the University of Chicago. Bright came, therefore, to the only institution as yet organized in this country for advanced instruction. He threw himself enthusiastically into the new movement which President Gilman and his associates had inaugurated, and became one of the pioneers of the higher learning in America. Philology was his chosen field, and here indeed he found the workers few and the need great. Classical philology, it is true, had already begun to thrive, under the inspiring leadership of Gildersleeve. But modern philology was still in leading-strings, and was looked upon by the general public as a field meet for Continental refugees and broken-down clergymen rather than for men of science. Yet the greater the need the greater the opportunity, and men like Elliott, Cook, Wood and Bright were at hand to lay the foundations for that scientific activity to which this journal is devoted. After some hesitation, Bright chose English philology as his special field. He took his doctor's degree at Johns Hopkins in 1882, and after some semesters of study in Germany returned to this country in 1884. He was made Instructor in English in the University in 1885, Associate in 1887, Associate Professor in 1891 and Professor in 1893. In 1905 he was appointed, to the Caroline Donovan Professorship. He became Professor Emeritus in 1924. He died November 29, 1926.

Apart from his distinguished contributions to learning in his chosen field, Bright's greatest title to remembrance will lie in the fifty-five doctors of philosophy whom he trained in the ways of

science and sent forth to spread the gospel of learning pure and undefiled. But the part which he played in the history of this journal is of special interest to us and to our readers. This part was a notable one. He was one of the original board of editors that Elliott gathered round him, and from the beginning he helped to shape the ideals and the policy of the journal. In 1916 he became its editor-in-chief, and only at the beginning of the present year did he retire from active participation and leave to younger hands the task of carrying on. The editors offer this, the first volume published under their direction, as a tribute to his memory.

K. M.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
James Wilson Bright.....	v
Tilley, Morris P., A Parody of <i>Euphues</i> in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> .....	1
Silz, Walter, Nature in the Tales of Otto Ludwig.....	8
Brown, Beatrice, Robert of Gloucester's <i>Chronicle</i> and the <i>Life of St. Kenelm</i> . . . . .	13
Patzer, Otto, Unwritten Works of Flaubert . . . . .	24
Ibershoff, C. H., Bodmer and Thomson's <i>Seasons</i> . . . . .	29
Baldwin, T. W., Nathaniel Field and Robert Wilson . . . . .	32
Watts, George B., Was Dancourt a Plagiarist?... . . . .	34
Gilbert, Allan H., A Source of Peele's <i>Arraignment of Paris</i> .....	36
Guilloton, Vincent, 'Il est pourtant temps, comme dit la chanson,'..	40
Bell, Clair Hayden, Middle High German <i>Zitarie, Zitterre</i> .....	43
Sandison, Helen, The Unblemished Garments in <i>The Tempest</i> .....	44
Graham, Walter, Scott's Dilemma. . . . .	45
Roberts, John H., A Note on Samuel Daniel's <i>Civile Wars</i> . . . . .	48
Mustard, W. P., "Hippocrates' Twins" . . . . .	50
Banks, Theodore H., Jr., Sir John Denham and <i>Paradise Lost</i> ....	51
Ham, Roswell G., Otway's Duels with Churchill and Settle.....	73
Havens, Raymond D., William Somerville's Earliest Poem.....	80
Campbell, T. M., Friedrich Schlegel's Apostasy and the <i>Europa</i> ....	86
Wright, Louis B., Notes on <i>Fulgens and Lucrez</i> : New Light on the Interlude . . . . .	97
Boucke, E. A., A Reply.....	100
Crawford, J. P. Wickersham, Notes on Three Sonnets of Boscán....	102
Van Roosbroeck, Gustave L., Neglected Verse by the Abbé de Chaulieu . . . . .	105
Krumpelmann, John T., Goethe's <i>Faust</i> , 4203-4205 . . . . .	107
Liljegren, S. B., Heine's <i>Doppelgänger</i> .....	115
Holmes, U. T., Villon's <i>Testament</i> , Line 1194 . . . . .	116
Watts, George B., Notes on Voltaire.....	118
Hespelt, E. Herman, A Second Pseudonym of Cecilia Böhl de Arrom,	123
Emerson, Oliver Farrar, A New Word and a New Meaning.....	125
Draper, John W., More Light on Spenser's Linguistics.....	127
Jones, Howard Mumford, The Author of Two Byron Apocrypha....	129
Wells, Whitney, Spenser's Dragon....	143
Herrick, Marvin T., Joseph Trapp and the Aristotelian "Catharsis,"	158
Schaffer, Aaron, Albert Glatigny: A Study in Literary Relationships,	164
Pierce, Frederick E., Two Notes on Blake.....	169
Emerson, Oliver Farrar, The Crux in the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> ....	170
Shackford, Martha Hale, <i>Julius Caesar</i> and Ovid.....	172
Altrocchi, Rudolph, Scott, Manzoni, Rovani.....	175

	PAGE
Schlutter, Otto B., King Ælfred's Interpretation of Exodus xxii, 18..	177
Judson, Alexander C., Cornelius Agrippa and Henry Vaughan.....	178
Johnston, Oliver M., Use of <i>de</i> before <i>endroit</i> in Old French .....	181
Morley, S. Griswold, A Note on the Spanish Octosyllable.....	182
Schwartz, William Leonard, E. Bergerat's "Ramouki le casseur de pierres," .....	185
Sturtevant, Albert M., Zum Fugenvokal in westgermanischen Kompositis .....	188
Mustard, W. P., Note on John Lyly's <i>Midas</i> .....	193
Kirkconnell, Watson, The <i>Epilogue to Dramatis Personae</i> ....	213
Moore, C. A., <i>Midnight's Meditations</i> (1646). A Bibliographical Puzzle .....	220
Brown, A. C. L., Did Chrétien identify the Grail with the Mass?..	226
Lemmi, C. W., Monster-spawning Nile-mud in Spenser.....	234
Bussom, T. W., Mme de Sévigné and La Fontaine.....	239
Blankenagel, J. C., Alfred Zimmermann as a Source of Hauptmann's <i>Weber</i> .....	242
Hebel, J. William, Dayton and Shakespeare... ..	248
Harrison, T. P., Jr., Concerning <i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> and Montemayor's <i>Diana</i> .....	251
Bullock, Walter L., Italian Sixteenth-Century Criticism.....	254
Mackenzie, W. Roy, "Standing Water,".....	283
Nicolson, Marjorie H., Milton's "Old Damocetas," .....	293
Small, George W., The Syntax of <i>the</i> with the Comparative.....	300
Cawley, Robert R., A Chaucerian Echo in Spenser.....	313
Pennington, Walter, The "Lucy" Poems .....	314
Parker, Roscoe E., A Note on <i>Corones Two</i> ....	317
Cooper, C. B., Tintinnabulation .....	318
Bender, Clifford A., Another Forgotten Novel .....	319
Richards, Alfred E., Milton's Popularity in the Eighteenth Century..	322
Greenlaw, Edwin, Two Notes on Spenser's Classical Sources.....	323
Rollins, Hyder E., <i>A Handful of Pleasant Delights</i> .....	327
Noyes, E. S., A Note on <i>Peregrine Pickle</i> and <i>Pygmalion</i> .....	327
Eddy, William A., <i>The Anatomist Dissected</i> —by Lemuel Gulliver..	330
McDowell, George Tremaine, General James Wilkinson in the Knickerbocker <i>History of New York</i> .....	353
Cook, Albert Stanburrough, Hellenic and Beowulfian Shields and Spears .....	360
Lawrence, W. J., Elizabethan Players as Tradesfolk.....	363
Austin, Herbert D., Dante Notes.....	364
Sturtevant, Albert Morey, Some Old Norse Eymologies.....	370
Faverty, Frederick E., The Rolls of Parliament and the New English Dictionary..	375
Fairchild, Hoxie Neale, 'Leyde here legges aliri,'.....	378
Sturtevant, Albert Morey, The Imperative Use of the Gothic Infinitive <i>haban</i> in Luke IX, 3.....	382

# CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
Beatty, Joseph M., Jr., Mrs. Montagu, Churchill, and Mrs. Cheere.	384
Covington, F. F., Jr., An Early Seventeenth Century Criticism of Spenser . . . . .	386
Coffman, Bertha Reed, A Note on Hagedorn's and Haller's German- English Relations. . . . .	387
Kennedy, Arthur G., Authorship of <i>The British Grammar</i> . . . .	388
Alpern, Hymen, A Note on Guillen de Castro..... . . . .	391
Farnham, Willard, <i>The Merchant's Tale</i> in Chaucer Junior.....	392
Bell, Herman, A Source for <i>Tarluffe</i> , 1067-1070 . . . . .	396
Schinz, Albert, Bibliographie critique de Jean-Jacques Rousseau dans les cinq dernières années . . . . .	423
Shanks, L. P., Baudelaire and the Arts . . . . .	439
Zeydel, Edwin H., A Note on Tieck's Early Romanticism . . . .	444
Schwartz, William L., The Question of Personal Caricature in <i>Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie</i> . . . . .	449
Menner, Robert J., Four Notes on the West Midland Dialect.....	454
Smith, Horatio E., Horace Walpole anticipates Victor Hugo . . .	458
Tilley, M. P., A Neglected Sixteenth-century "of-or" Construction.	462
Havens, Raymond D., Blake and Browning . . . . .	464
Malone, Kemp, A Note on <i>Beowulf</i> 1231 . . . . .	466
Pillionnel, J. H., Voltaire et Christophe de Beaumont . . . . .	467
Braginton, Mary V., Two Notes on Senecan Tragedy.. . . .	468
Dunbabin, R. L., A Rhetorical Figure in Shakespeare..... .	469
Lancaster, H. Carrington, <i>Toutes</i> for <i>Tous</i> .....	470
Campbell, T. M., History as Costume in Hebbel's Dramas. . . . .	489
Lathrop, H. B., The Translations of John Tiptoft.....	496
Banks, T. H., Jr., Denham's supposed Authorship of <i>Directions to a Painter</i> , 1667..... . . . .	502
Chapman, C. O., <i>The Pardoner's Tale</i> : a Mediaeval Sermon.....	506
Bush, J. N. D., Two Poems by Henry Reynolds..... . . . .	510
Porterfield, A. W., <i>Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre</i> and <i>Immensee</i> .. . .	513
Wright, L. B., Will Kemp and the <i>Commedia dell' Arte</i> . . . . .	516
Heller, E. K., Wolfram's Relationship to the Crestien MSS . . . . .	520
Clark, Eleanor G., <i>Titus and Vespasian</i> ... . . . .	523
Thaler, A., Queen Elizabeth and Benedick's "Partridge Wing," . . .	527
Hartman, H., The Home of the <i>Ludus Coventriae</i> ... . . . .	530
McKeehan, Irene P., A Neglected Example of the <i>In Memoriam</i> Stanza . . . . .	531
✓ Brereton, J. L., <i>L'Allegro</i> 45-48.....	533
Hammond, Eleanor P., Boethius: Chaucer: Walton: Lydgate..... .	534
Post, L. A., Note on Shakespeare's <i>King John</i> .....	535
Aurner, Nellie S., Bede and Pausanias.....	535
Stenberg, T., The Pater-Saintsbury Definition of Criticism.....	536

## REVIEWS

Denis Saurat, Milton, Man and Thinker. [ <i>J. H. Hanford.</i> ]	55
Helen McMillan Buckhurst, An Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic. [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ]	59
Margaret de Schweinitz, Les Epitaphes de Ronsard. [ <i>Paul Laumonier.</i> ]	60
John Koch, Geoffrey Chaucers Canterbury-Erzählungen. [ <i>T. F. Crane.</i> ]	64
Lewis Freeman Mott, Sainte-Beuve. [ <i>Horatio E. Smith.</i> ]	67
Chauncey B. Tinker, Letters of James Boswell. [ <i>Raymond D. Havens.</i> ]	71
Elizabeth Wheeler Manwaring, Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England. [ <i>Raymond D. Havens.</i> ]	132
Morris Edmund Speare, The Political Novel: Its Development in England and America. [ <i>Gustavus Howard Maynardier.</i> ]	134
Bert J. Vos and Preston A. Barba, German Lyrics and Ballads, from Klopstock to Modern Times. [ <i>James Taft Hatfield.</i> ]	135
Maximilian J. Rudwin, A Historical and Bibliographical Survey of the German Religious Drama. [ <i>Neil C. Brooks.</i> ]	137
Mélanges de Philologie, offerts à M. Johan Vising. [ <i>Urban T. Holmes.</i> ]	138
James Brown Scott, Le Français, Langue Diplomatique Moderne. [ <i>Albert Schinz.</i> ]	140
Pierre Louis Duchartre, La Comédie italienne. [ <i>Winifred Smith.</i> ]	142
Ezio Levi, Il Principe Don Carlos nella Leggenda e nella Poesia. [ <i>Frederick W. C. Lieder.</i> ]	194
William P. Shepard, Les Poésies de Jausbert de Puyebot. [ <i>Edward L. Adams.</i> ]	197
Elise Dosenheimer, Das Zentrale Problem in der Tragödie Friedrich Hebbels. [ <i>T. M. Campbell.</i> ]	200
L. R. Merrill, The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald. [ <i>W. P. Mustard.</i> ]	202
Edward H. Sehart, Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum <i>Heliand</i> und zur alt-sächsischen <i>Genesis</i> . [ <i>Daniel B. Shumway.</i> ]	204
Gilbert Chinard, Jefferson et les Idéologues. [ <i>George Boas.</i> ]	205
Margaret Alterton, Origins of Poe's Critical Theory. [ <i>Killis Campbell.</i> ]	208
George Coffin Taylor, Shakspeare's Debt to Montaigne. [ <i>James W. Tupper.</i> ]	209
Mary Catherine McMahon, Aesthetics and Art in the <i>Astrée</i> of Honoré d'Urfé. [ <i>Albert Schinz.</i> ]	211
Percival Merritt, Piozzi Marginalia. [ <i>Raymond D. Havens.</i> ]	212
Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne by Members of the English Department of the Univ. of Michigan. [ <i>Allan H. Gilbert.</i> ]	264
Allan H. Gilbert, Dante's Conception of Justice. [ <i>C. H. Grandgent.</i> ]	268
F. Holthausen, Altfriesisches Wörterbuch. [ <i>Edward H. Sehart.</i> ]	270
Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies. [ <i>Edwin Greenlaw.</i> ]	271

# CONTENTS

xi

Pierre Lasserre, <i>La Jeunesse d'Ernest Renan</i> . [Horatio E. Smith.]..	273
A. F. B. Clark, Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830). [C. H. C. Wright.].....	275
Louise Delpit, <i>Paris-Théâtre Contemporain</i> . [Maurice E. Coindreau.]	277
H. H. Houben, <i>Gespräche mit Heine</i> . [Franz Schneider.].....	279
H. Ashton, <i>Lettres de Madame de La Fayette et de Gilles Ménage</i> . [Maud Elizabeth Temple.].....	281
Herman C. G. Brandt, <i>A German-English Dictionary</i> . [W. Kurrel- meyer.] .....	282
J. W. Krutch, <i>Comedy and Conscience after the Reformation</i> . [John W. Draper.].....	332
Ernest Weekley, <i>A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern Eng- lish</i> . [John C. French.].....	334
Georges Girard, <i>La Jeunesse d'Anatole France</i> ; Michel Corday, <i>Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France</i> . } [J. K. Ditchy.]	334
Charles Tailliart, <i>L'Algérie dans la Littérature Française; Essai de Bibliographie Méthodique et Raisonnée</i> . [Gilbert Chinard.].....	336
Edmond Huguet, <i>Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizième Siècle</i> . [H. O. Lancaster.].....	339
T. F. Crane, <i>Liber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie</i> . [Grace Frank.] .....	340
Bernard Mandeville, <i>The Fable of the Bees</i> . Edited by F. B. Kaye. [Edwin Greenlaw.].....	341
Fr. Aurelius Pompen, <i>The English Versions of The Ship of Fools</i> . [Frederick M. Padelford.].....	344
Jules Vodoz, <i>La Fée aux Miettes</i> . [L. Piaget Shanks.].....	346
Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 3-5. [W. Kurrelmeyer.] ...	347
H. Carrington Lancaster, <i>Chryseïde et Arimant</i> , <i>Tragicomédie de Jean Mairet (1625)</i> . [Colbert Searles.].....	348
Edgar Milton Bowman, <i>The Early Novels of Paul Bourget</i> . [James D. Sorber.].....	349
Pierre Champion, <i>Ronsard et son Temps</i> . [H. O. Lancaster.].....	351
F. Vézinet, <i>Autour de Voltaire, avec quelques inédits</i> . [Gilbert Chinard.] .....	352
J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> . [Robert J. Menner.].....	397
Richard Jordan, <i>Handbuch der mittellenglischen Grammatik</i> . [Kemp Malone.] .....	400
Maurice Mignon, <i>Etudes sur le théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance</i> . [Winifred Smith.].....	401
Aage Brusendorff, <i>The Chaucer Tradition</i> . [Ernest Kuhl.].....	402
Laura A. Hibbard, <i>Medieval Romance in England</i> . [Kemp Malone.]	406
Marjorie L. Henry, <i>L'Appel de la route</i> , par Edouard Estaunié. [H. O. Lancaster.].....	407

	PAGE
Henry Ten Eyck Perry, <i>The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama</i> . [ <i>Frank W. Chandler.</i> ] . . . . .	408
Emile Malakis, <i>French Travellers in Greece (1770-1820)</i> . [ <i>Gilbert Chinard.</i> ] . . . . .	410
Sister M. Madeleva, <i>Pearl: A Study in Spiritual Dryness</i> . [ <i>Robert J. Menner.</i> ] . . . . .	411
George B. Ives and Grace Norton, <i>The Essays of Montaigne</i> . [ <i>G. C. Taylor.</i> ] . . . . .	414
Robert Petsch, <i>Gehalt und Form</i> . [ <i>A. B. Faust.</i> ] . . . . .	417
Richard Ashley Rice, <i>Rousseau and the Poetry of Nature in Eighteenth Century France</i> . [ <i>Gilbert Chinard.</i> ] . . . . .	418
Kenneth Ballard Murdock, <i>Increase Mather</i> . [ <i>John C. French.</i> ] . . . .	419
Joseph Epes Brown, <i>The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson</i> . [ <i>Raymond D. Havens.</i> ] . . . . .	420
Destutt de Tracy and Gilbert Chinard, <i>De l'Amour</i> . [ <i>Paul Hazard.</i> ] . . .	421
Philipp Aronstein, <i>Englische Wortkunde</i> . [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ] . . . . .	471
Georg Stefansky, <i>Das hellenisch-deutsche Weltbild</i> . [ <i>T. M. Campbell.</i> ] . .	474
Fernand Baldensperger, <i>Le mouvement des Idées dans l'Emigration Française</i> . [ <i>Gilbert Chinard.</i> ] . . . . .	476
Paul Böckmann, <i>Schillers Geisteshaltung als Bedingung seines dramatischen Schaffens</i> . [ <i>T. M. Campbell.</i> ] . . . . .	480
Cephas Guillet, <i>An Oral French Grammar</i> . [ <i>Eunice R. Goddard.</i> ] . . .	482
<i>Studies in German Literature, in Honor of Alexander Rudolph Hohlfeld</i> . [ <i>Albert B. Faust.</i> ] . . . . .	483
J. Hurtado y A. G. Palencia, <i>Historia de la Literatura Española</i> . [ <i>José Robles.</i> ] . . . . .	486
Mary Duclaux, <i>The Life of Racine</i> . [ <i>H. Carrington Lancaster.</i> ] . . . .	487
Albert S. Cook and Chauncey B. Tinker, <i>Translations from Old English Poetry</i> . [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ] . . . . .	488
R. K. Root, <i>The Book of Troilus and Criseyde</i> . By Geoffrey Chaucer. [ <i>Karl Young.</i> ] . . . . .	537
F. von der Leyen, <i>Bücher des Mittelalters</i> . [ <i>T. F. Crane.</i> ] . . . . .	545
R. C. Williams, <i>The Merveilleux in the Epic</i> . [ <i>W. L. Bullock.</i> ] . . . .	550
Lucy M. Bugbee, <i>An Explanatory Course in General Language</i> ; . . . . .	} [ <i>K. Malone.</i> ] 553
H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins, <i>The Gateway to English</i> . . . . .	
Adolf Kolsen, <i>Trobadorgedichte</i> . [ <i>W. P. Shepard.</i> ] . . . . .	555
F. N. Scott, <i>The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers</i> . [ <i>K. Malone.</i> ] . . . . .	557
—	
Index . . . . .	559
Recent Publications . . . . .	i-xliv



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

January, 1926

Number 1

---

## A PARODY OF *EUPHUES* IN *ROMEO AND JULIET*

BY MORRIS P. TILLEY

Students of John Lyly have accepted as correct Landmann's statement<sup>1</sup> that Shakespeare purposely ridicules euphuism in only one passage. This passage is found in the *First Part of Henry the Fourth*,<sup>2</sup> where Falstaff and Hal "practice an answer" for Hal's meeting on the morrow with his father, the King. Landmann, however, was wrong in asserting that the parody in *Henry the Fourth* was the only passage in which Shakespeare ridicules euphuism. There is another, earlier passage in Shakespeare of the same nature, which has escaped attention. This earlier parody is as definite in its ridicule of euphuism, though possibly not as skillful. At the same time, it is more personal than the later parody. Shakespeare employs in the two allusions radically different methods of ridiculing the outworn conventions of *Euphues*.<sup>3</sup>

The passage in question is found in Act I, Scene ii, lines 34-61, of *Romeo and Juliet*:

*Capulet.*

Go, sirrah, trudge about

Through fair Verona; find those persons out

---

<sup>1</sup> *New Shakespeare Society Transactions*, 1880-5, "Shakespeare and Euphuism," p. 250. In reviewing Landmann's article in *Englische Studien*, vi, 1883, p. 102, Dr. Swan was able to show that this parody is both more intensive and more extensive than Landmann had recognized. In connection with the declining influence of Lyly's style, it is noteworthy that Shakespeare ridicules the old play, *King Cambyses*, in the same scene in *Henry the Fourth* in which he ridicules *Euphues*.

<sup>2</sup> II. iv, 438-61.

<sup>3</sup> In *Henry the Fourth* the mocking tone of Falstaff and Hal clearly indicates their purpose (and Shakespeare's) to be a burlesque of *Euphues*; in the earlier allusion a misquotation by a clownish servant of a passage as "it is written" in *Euphues* obscures the same, less obvious, though none the less certain, purpose of Shakespeare.

Whose names are written there, and to them say,  
My house and welcome on their pleasure stay.

[*Exit Capulet.*]

*Servant.* Find them out whose names are written here! *It is written that the shoemaker should meddle with his yard, and the tailor with his last, the fisher with his pencil, and the painter with his nets; but I am sent to find those persons whose names are here writ, and can never find what names the writing person hath here writ. I must to the learned. In good time.*

[*Enter Benvolio and Romeo.*]

*Servant.* God gr' good-den. I pray, sir, can you read?

*Romeo.* Ay, mine own fortune in my misery.

*Servant.* Perhaps you have learned it without book; but, I pray, can you read anything you see?

Capulet's old Servant is here reflecting upon the embarrassment that has arisen for him from his inability to read the names of the guests to be invited to Capulet's "old accustomed feast." He is bidden to "find those persons out whose names are written here," a task, he frankly admits, above his wit. As the Servant explains, in words that are intended by their rude imitation of the euphuistic style to express his admiration for that style, he has been "sent to find those persons whose names are here writ, and can never find what names the writing person hath here writ." In concluding that he should not have exchanged the humbler occupation of servant for the higher duties of messenger, he reflects: "It is written that the shoemaker should meddle with his yard, and the tailor with his last, the fisher with his pencil and the painter with his nets." In place of his "It is written" here, he might have said, "It is written in *Euphues*," for in the confused words following he is not indulging in clownish nonsense of his own vintage, as has been assumed to be the case, but is unmistakably misquoting 'old truths' from the *Epistle Dedicatory* of the *Anatomy of Wit*.

The passage in the *Epistle Dedicatory* of *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*,<sup>4</sup> from which the Servant borrows the old sayings, is as follows:

The shoemaker must not go above his latchet, nor the hedger meddle

<sup>4</sup> *Euphues*, Croll and Clemons' edition, p. 5.

with anything but his bill. It is unseemly for the painter to feather a shaft, or the fletcher to handle a pencil.

The relation of the Servant's words to this passage in *Euphues* has been so effectively obscured by the speaker's inability to make his own thoughts clear, that it will be necessary to take up the Servant's proverbs, one by one, to compare each with its original in *Euphues*. But, before doing this, I wish to point out two causes that have contributed to the obscuring of the allusion.

The more important of the two causes is the fact that the 'old truths,' that are negatively stated in *Euphues*, appear in the Servant's words in affirmative form. To assist in removing the difficulty due to this fact, I shall restate Lyly's proverbs in affirmative form and place them beside the original, negative forms:

<p><i>Euphues</i> [original form]. (1) The shoemaker must <i>not</i> go above his latchet, <i>nor</i> (2) the hedger meddle with anything but his bill. It is <i>unseemly</i> for (3) the painter to feather a shaft, or (4) the fletcher to handle the pencil.</p>	<p><i>Euphues</i> [altered form]. (1) The shoemaker <i>should</i> stick to his last, and (2) the hedger <i>should</i> meddle with his bill. (3) The fletcher <i>should</i> feather his shaft, (4) and the painter <i>should</i> handle his pencil.</p>
---	--

The second cause for our failure to recognize Lyly's proverbs in *Romeo and Juliet* is the Servant's obvious practice of misplacing his words. His blunders of this kind, and their corrections, are shown in the original and altered versions of his words as follows:

<p><i>Romeo and Juliet</i> [original form]. It is written that (1) the shoemaker should meddle with his <i>yard</i>, and (2) the tailor with his <i>last</i>, (3) the fisher with his <i>pencil</i>, and (4) the painter with his <i>nets</i>.</p>	<p><i>Romeo and Juliet</i> [altered form]. It is written that (1) the shoemaker should meddle with his <i>last</i>, and (2) the tailor (should meddle) with his <i>yard</i>, (3) the fisher (should meddle) with his <i>nets</i>, and (4) the painter (should meddle) with his <i>pencil</i>.</p>
--	---

With this preparation for the understanding of the puzzle presented, it will be helpful in our comparison to have the two *original* passages side by side:

<p><i>Euphues</i>. (1) The shoemaker must not go above his latchet, nor (2) the hedger meddle with any-</p>	<p><i>Romeo and Juliet</i>. It is written that (1) the shoemaker should meddle with his yard, and (2) the</p>
---	---

thing but his bill. It is unseemly for (3) the painter to feather a shaft, or (4) the fletcher to handle a pencil.	tailor (should meddle) with his last, (3) the fisher (should med- dle) with his pencil, and (4) the painter (should meddle) with his nets.
---	--

We are now ready to take up the Servant's proverbs in order to compare each with the corresponding proverb in *Euphues*. An important part of the comparison consists in the verbal-linking of each of the Servant's proverbs with two or more of the proverbs in *Euphues*.

Restating Lyly's first negative injunction, "The shoemaker should not go above his latchet," in its affirmative form, we obtain a more common form of the proverb, "The shoemaker should stick to his last." If now in (1) in *R. and J.* the Servant's blunder of 'yard' for 'last' is corrected, we have, but for the word 'meddle,' borrowed by the Servant from (2) in *E.*, a form identical with the affirmative form of (1) in *E.*, "The shoemaker should meddle with his last."

Proverb (2) in *R. and J.*, "The tailor (should meddle) with his last," upon second reading, is seen to share with (2) in *E.* the important verb 'meddle.' When (2) in *R. and J.* is freed of its confusion of thought by an exchange of the word 'last' for the similarly misplaced word 'yard' in (1) in *R. and J.*, a proverb emerges, "The tailor should *meddle* with his yard." This proverb repeats the proverbial injunction to 'follow one's vocation,' which is the text of Lyly's proverb (2) in *E.*, "The hedger should *meddle* with his bill." In this connection it is to be noted that 'follow one's vocation' is the text of the four *corrected* proverbs in *R. and J.*, as it is the text of the four proverbs in *E.*

Continuing our examination of the Servant's proverbs, we have in (3) in *R. and J.*, "The fisher (should meddle) with his pencil," a double verbal-linking of the Servant's words with Lyly's proverbs (2) and (4): with (2) in *E.* through 'meddle,' and with (4) in *E.* through 'pencil.' If now we correct the Servant's blunder in (3) by restoring to the 'fisher' his 'nets' in (4), we have the proverb, "The fisher should meddle with his nets." Turning now from (3) in *R. and J.* to (3) in *E.*, and restating the negative injunction, "It is unseemly for the painter to feather a shaft," in affirmative form, by borrowing from (4) in *E.* the

word 'fletcher,' we have the proverb, "The fletcher should feather his shaft." Proverb (3) in *R. and J.* and (3) in *E.*, therefore, agree in expressing the same proverbial injunction to 'follow one's vocation.' In repeating the same proverbial truth in different form in *R. and J.* and in *E.*, (3) and (2) in each are similar.<sup>5</sup>

In proverb (4) in *R. and J.*, "The painter (should meddle) with his nets," there is a triple verbal-linking with the proverbs in *Euphues*: with (2) in *E.* through 'meddle'; with (3) in *E.* through 'painter'; and with (4) in *E.* through 'pencil,' after the word 'pencil' from (3) in *R. and J.* has been substituted for the word 'nets' in (4) in *R. and J.* The correction of the Servant's blunder of 'nets' for 'pencil' gives us the proverb, "The painter should meddle with his pencil," which agrees, but for the Servant's substitution of 'meddle' for 'handle,' with Lyly's proverb (4), "The painter should handle his pencil."

These changes accomplished, a comparison of the *altered* forms of the two passages makes clearer the source of the Servant's proverbs:

*Euphues* [altered form]. (1) The shoemaker should stick to his last, and (2) the hedger should *meddle with* his bill, (3) The fletcher should feather his shaft, and (4) the painter should handle his pencil.

*Romeo and Juliet* [altered form]. It is written that (1) the shoemaker should meddle with his last, (2) the tailor (should meddle) with his yard, (3) the fisher (should meddle) with his nets, (4) and the painter (should meddle) with his pencil.

It will further assist our understanding of the Servant's words, to inquire into what was Shakespeare's probable purpose in having the Servant express his thoughts as he does. Obviously, he desired to reflect in the Servant's words a characteristic confusion of thought on the part of Capulet's messenger. To this end he has the Servant select from Lyly's four verbs the verb 'meddle,' to use it in place of Lyly's three verbs, 'go above,' 'feather,' and 'handle.' The obtrusion of this word into the form of each of the four proverbs confuses the thought, mainly by reason of the absence of an accompanying negative particle. An even more serious

<sup>5</sup> Shakespeare's substitution of the 'tailor' and the 'fisher' proverbs for Lyly's 'hedger' and 'fletcher' proverbs *may* be connected with quibbles similar in character to other broad quibbles in *Romeo and Juliet*.

confusion of thought, due again to the omission of the necessary negative, is caused by the Servant's misplacing of words. The omitted negative key-word supplied, however, the Servant's nonsense promptly converts to sense; and Shakespeare's purpose is seen to have been to show that the Servant's mind was incapable of supplying the negative, without which his words are unintelligible. When the negative particle is supplied, moreover, more is accomplished than merely redeeming the Servant's words from nonsense. With the negative the allusion to *Euphues* (which without it is obscured in the confusion of the Servant's thought) becomes clear. The Servant's words would then read, "It is written that the shoemaker should *not* meddle with the yard, *nor* the tailor with the last; the fisher should *not* meddle with the pencil, *nor* the painter with the nets."

This is related in form to that part of the *Euphues* passage in which Lyly enjoins that "it is *unseemly* for the *painter* to feather a *shaft*, or for the *fletcher* to handle a *pencil*." The Servant, however, missing the negative form of the injunctions, understood Lyly to enjoin that "the shoemaker *should* go above his latchet, and the hedger *should* meddle with anything but his bill; the painter *should* feather a shaft, and the fletcher *should* handle the pencil." With this incorrect understanding of Lyly's old sayings, the Servant sets out to repeat them to the best of his humble ability, with the result, as we have seen, of a complete confusion of the sense of the proverbs, together with an effective obscuring of their source.

But the "prosperity" of Shakespeare's jest is not exhausted in tracing the Servant's proverbs to their source. Certain implications arising from the allusion deserve attention. For one thing, the clown's determination at the end of his soliloquy to seek the aid of the "learned" suggests an allusion to Lyly's having sought the aid of certain learned and eloquent writers in his composition of *Euphues*. A similar charge, made against him by Nashe and Harvey among others, before Shakespeare glanced at this practice of his, had already been admitted by Lyly in his *Epistle Dedicatory to Euphues and His England*, where he says that 'he will not deny but that he is one of those poets which the painters feign to come unto Homer's basin, there to lap up that he doth cast up.'

The particular "prosperity of the jest," however, lies in the

suggested similarity between the Servant, confessing his lack of wit, and Lyly's acknowledging his unfitness to "discourse of wit." To appreciate this it is necessary to know the context of the "old truths" in *Euphues*:

Which discourse, Right Honourable, I hope you will the rather pardon for the rudeness in that it is the first, and protect it the more willingly if it offend in that it shall be the last. *It may be that fine wits will descant upon him that, having no wit, goeth about to make the Anatomy of Wit; and certainly their jesting in my mind is tolerable.* For if the butcher should take upon him to cut the anatomy of a man because he hath skill in opening an ox, he would prove himself a calf; or if the horse-leech would adventure to minister a potion to a sick patient he would make himself an ass. The shoemaker must not go above his latchet, nor the hedger meddle with anything but his bill. It is unseemly for the painter to feather a shaft, or the fletcher to handle the pencil. *All which things make most against me in that a fool hath intruded himself to discourse of wit.*

This passage is remarkable for its frankness. In it Lyly, in prophetic words, anticipates "that fine wits may descant upon him that, having no wit, goeth about to make the Anatomy of Wit." "And certainly," he adds here, "their jesting in my mind is tolerable." Following this remark is a string of observations in euphuistic fashion illustrating the "truth" that one should follow his vocation. After the illustrations of the unwise "butcher" and "horse-leech," who did not "stick to their lasts," come the other "truths" to the same effect, which had lingered confusedly in the memory of Capulet's servant. From them Lyly draws the conclusion, gleefully applauded by Shakespeare, that "all which things make most against me in that a fool hath intruded himself to discourse of wit."

These words of Lyly's, virtually inviting the fine wits of the time to descant upon their author, did not escape Shakespeare. He saw in them an excellent opportunity to gird at the "witty and eloquent" author of *Euphues*; and when a favorable opportunity presented itself, he proceeded to "descant upon him that, having no wit, goeth about to make the Anatomy of Wit."

In all probability Shakespeare's auditors, recovered from the general epidemic of euphuism, laughed merrily over Shakespeare's allusion to Lyly's inadequacy to write the Anatomy of Wit. However, whether or no Shakespeare's audience caught and enjoyed

to the full the allusion, certainly, in our minds, his jesting at Lyly's expense is delightfully "tolerable." And it is the more "tolerable" because of the fact that Shakespeare chose the dull mind of a humble admirer of *Euphues* as the appropriate instrument through which to glance at the glare and glitter of Lyly's style, as well as at Lyly himself.

*University of Michigan.*

## NATURE IN THE TALES OF OTTO LUDWIG

BY WALTER SILZ

Otto Ludwig, who has been called "der bodenständigste aller deutschen grossen Dichter,"<sup>1</sup> had not only a passionate attachment to his native soil, but, intimately connected therewith, a love of nature sufficiently extraordinary to have attracted the attention of the pathologist.<sup>2</sup> This unusual sensitivity to nature is reflected in many of Ludwig's works, but most directly and characteristically in those tales which he wrote, as he said, behind his own back, as a subvention to his more important dramatic projects.<sup>3</sup> The treatment of nature in these tales, which range in date from 1828 to 1856, may in fact be regarded as symptomatic of Ludwig's gradual, and by no means undeviating development from the Romanticism of his youth to the "poetic realism" of his later years.

The earliest of these stories, the fragment *Campana*, written while Ludwig was still a student at Hildburghausen, is typically Romantic in its conception of nature, being at times reminiscent of Eichendorff.<sup>4</sup> Each of its two chapters opens with a description of nature, in which all things are alive: the sun retires, pale with

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm Greiner, *Otto Ludwig als Thüringer in seinem Leben und seinen Werken*, Halle a. S. (Moritz), 1913, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ernst Jentsch, *Das Pathologische bei Otto Ludwig*, Wiesbaden (Bergmann), 1913, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Erich Schmidt and Adolf Stern, Leipzig (Grunow), 1891, vi, 375-376.

<sup>4</sup> *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Paul Merker and others, München (Müller), 1912 ff., III, 211 ff. (cf. the harangue in Eichendorff's *Taugenichts*, chapter 9), 219 f. The following references are to volume and page of Merker's edition.



jealousy, before her rival, the moon; trees, flowers and waves go to sleep and dream of stars and eternal spring (III, 209). The sun descends into the shaft of night to mine new brilliance for the morrow (III, 214), while its gentle echo, the moon, lets its light *resound* over the landscape, and plays like a laughing child about the old church (III, 216). The distant hills, "blue pillars of heaven," have an exalting and soothing influence on the human soul (III, 221), and, as in Eichendorff, love of nature passes into love of God (III, 220).

The next tale of Ludwig's that has been preserved, *Das Hausgesinde* (1840), though still predominantly Romantic, intermingling readily the natural and the supernatural, is in part, nevertheless, a parodical "Intriguenstück" in the style of Zschokke, that "thoroughly un-Romantic nature,"<sup>5</sup> and it is significant that nature plays very little part in it. In *Die Emanzipation der Domestiken* (1841), likewise, the background of nature is used sparingly, merely corroborating here and there human states of mind (I, 40 ff.); and the "hyper-Romantic" is spoken of disparagingly (I, 38).

*Die wahrhaftige Geschichte von den drei Wünschen* (1842-43), however, returns to the fantastic manner of E. T. A. Hoffmann, and the conception of nature is correspondingly Romantic: the air trembles and sighs at every movement of the beautiful Urvasi (I, 116 f.), and the fairy-tale is set in a vividly colored, luxuriant Oriental landscape (I, 135 f.).

In *Maria* (1843), nature is seen pictorially, with the eye of the landscape painter; for Ludwig, like Kleist, discovered in Dresden the beauties of painting. Throughout the story, the actions and states of the persons are correlated with the changing aspect of nature. From the very outset (I, 180 f.), nature is employed as a delicately attuned background against which the characters are seen. A sudden thunderstorm, which is described at length, parallels the confusion and sadness in the hero's soul (I, 210 f.); but his happy mood is reinforced by a sunny summer morning (I, 192 f.). The heroine, Marie, who, like her namesake in *Der*

<sup>5</sup> O. F. Walzel, *Deutsche Romantik*, Leipzig (Teubner), 1912, p. 121. *Das Hausgesinde* shows, in general and in particular, similarities to Zschokke's *Das Abenteuer der Neujahrsnacht*. Borchardt reports (III, p. xxvi) that Ludwig read Zschokke with pleasure in the late thirties.

*Erbförster*, is believed to have a mysterious connection with nature (I, 207), is driven from her father's house on a melancholy autumn evening (I, 230 f.). A verdant spring landscape surrounds her in her renewed hopefulness (I, 240), whereas a wild night of storm and rain accompanies her restless apprehension and introduces a scene of death (I, 245). Natural objects are endowed with human feelings in true Romantic fashion (I, 207, 215, 230, 231, 240). The moon, that most Romantic of luminaries, looms large in *Maria*. The heroine has a sympathetic relationship to it (I, 207 f.); its vague light contributes to the uncertainty and mysteriousness of events, and adds beauty or sadness to the scene (I, 189, 262, 188, 231).

This affinity between nature and mankind is thus described by Ludwig's hero: "Jedem andern ist die Natur ein Ding, eine Sache für den Nutzen oder für das Vergnügen; dem Germanen ist sie eine Person, die mit ihm empfindet wie er mit ihr. Von seinem innern Reichtum leiht er ihr die Seele, deren Sympathie ihn tröstet, erheitert, erhebt; sie ist sein Echo, sein Spiegelbild, das ihm als ein Selbständiges entgegentritt, und so ist sein Zusammenhang mit der Natur nur seine eigene innere Harmonie. Wer diese Harmonie aus sich herausgetrieben, der findet sie auch ausser sich nicht mehr; wer sich der Natur nicht verschliesst, dem verschliesst sich auch die Natur nicht" (I, 212).

*Die Buschnovelle* (1844) <sup>6</sup> is surrounded with the atmosphere of a fairy-tale chiefly because of Ludwig's Romantic use of nature. It abounds in soft-toned descriptions of the country-side, in which moonlight, picturesque mills and blue flowers are characteristic features (I, 276 f.). There are quiet evening scenes, when the day steals away like a nun, and only the distant fall of waters and the songs of birds are heard (I, 271, 286). The moon is a constant factor, lighting the principal scenes of the story and enhancing its weird unreality (I, 281, 282, 287, 296). Nature is frequently animated: the valley plays hide-and-seek with the wanderer; the rocks bend their gray heads curiously to hear the secrets whispered by bushes and flowers (I, 267-268); oaks embrace, a cleft hill strives to re-unite; a path stops to rest for a

<sup>6</sup> Rudolf Baumbach's *Das Habichtsfräulein* (1876) shows a number of correspondences with this story of his greater compatriot.

moment before climbing a steep hill (I, 268); dew sparkles like tears of joy in the blue eyes of the flowers (I, 297).

*Das Marchen vom toten Kinde* (ca. 1845), a queer combination of a fairy-tale with sharp and satirical realism, indicates, more clearly than any preceding story, a departure from the Romantic. There is still description and animation of nature (I, 307), and the moon is not forgotten (I, 330, 333); but Ludwig's realistic interests appear decidedly in the ascendancy. In the fragment *Aus einem alten Schulmeisterleben* (1845-46), written in the humorous-idyllic style of Jean Paul, a further stage of this transition may be seen: depiction and animation of nature have yielded completely to "kulturgeschichtliche Detailmalerei."

After a lapse of years, *Die Heiteretei* (1854), though marked by a realism of characterization which at times approaches caricature, nevertheless represents in its treatment of nature a return to Ludwig's earlier manner. Not only is the natural background carefully indicated at the important turns in the action, not only are persons frequently likened to things in nature (II, 27, 29, 147, 167, 172), but especially in this story Ludwig's animation of the inanimate runs riot. The moon rises on tiptoe to see its image in the wet street (II, 9); the path lingers fondly about the bushes and the cottage; willows go to meet the brook and escort it down the valley (II, 26). Houses are individualized (II, 29). Tables strive to approach the panelled walls, and the foot-rails below are engaged in running tirelessly from one table-leg to another (II, 30). The nodding lamp can scarcely keep its eyes open for sleepiness (II, 28). The sparks of an extinguished fire are personified as man, woman and child (II, 143). Nature lies in convulsions, and the funereal clouds, in the rôle of undertakers, are about to bury her alive (II, 81). The moon comes out to see the hero, and hides its face in fear; again, clad in a shirt, it rises from its bed, stops for a drink, and lies down to sleep (II, 110, 151, 181). The rain grows angry; it is welcomed as an ally by the traitorous rocks and holes in the wall (II, 164-165). The blue eye of heaven looks through the gray lashes of the rain (II, 170), while the morning wind, aided by the sun, labors to sweep the clouds from the sky (II, 171). Under the velvet mantle of the night, all nature is alive (II, 239).

But the most remarkable example of animation of nature is

that of the elder-bush which grows beside the cottage of the heroine. Ludwig has made of it a fully individualized *persona narrationis*; endowed with human feelings and powers, it is present at every important event in the story. It tucks the cottage benevolently under its arm (II, 26, 28); it shakes with laughter or contentment (II, 51, 115); it actively takes the part of the heroine against her enemies (II, 146); it reserves a window for its own use (II, 158). Both the hero and the heroine ascribe to it human emotions (II, 76, 174, 213, 240), and in fact it expresses grief, compassion, active though powerless distress, exultation, joy and sorrow (II, 164, 165, 214, 240). It advises the heroine, and divines human thoughts (II, 217, 244). Clad in holiday dress at the end, it rejoices audibly with the rocks and the flowers (II, 246-248).

It would seem as though Ludwig's delight in animate nature had spent itself in this final exuberance of *Die Heiteretei*. In the fragment *Dämon Geld*, which must have followed it closely, there is very little of nature, and that little has no longer a sovereign individuality of its own, nor a merely pictorial or emotional value, but is seen under a new guise. Ludwig still may compare the flesh under a woman's chin, swelling up on either side of a tight hat-ribbon, to the high banks of a brook; but the significance of such a comparison lies no longer on the side of nature, but in the acute observation of realistic detail.

*Aus dem Regen in die Traufe* (1855-56), being a by-product of *Die Heiteretei*, might be expected to show a retrogression into the style of that novel; yet there are in it barely a half-dozen cases of personification of natural objects (II, 280, 293, 320 f.), and its tone is more critical and realistic than that of its predecessor.

*Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, which, as Ludwig's letters show, was written shortly after *Aus dem Regen in die Traufe*, shows a further, and, as it happened, the last stage in the development of Ludwig's technique as a novelist. *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is much more dramatic than Ludwig's previous epic works. In its concentrated and intense action there is no room for broad, picturesque Romantic landscapes. Descriptions of natural scenery still occur, but they have neither the prominence nor the independent life of those of former days; rather they serve the purpose of occasional stage scenery, in front of which the physical or

psychical action runs its course. Fritz Nettenmair's swirling evil thoughts are merely illustrated by the eddying mist around him: "Es war ein Bild dessen, was in [seiner] Seele vorging" (III, 101). Similarly, a cloudy, sultry night witnesses his dastardly deed (III, 117); and a grandiose description of a gathering and breaking storm forms the setting for the final act of this dramatic story (III, 182-185). Sometimes the contrast of nature emphasizes the meaning of the action: thus the dreadful colloquy of Fritz and his father is set against a peaceful evening landscape (III, 137-138).

But these elements of nature are unimportant in comparison with those in *Die Heiteretei*. In *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* Ludwig has fully attained his new style, which he called "poetic realism" and which most nearly approaches the prose style of Heinrich von Kleist. In Ludwig's last story, psychological analysis and realistic detail have supplanted the luxuriant nature-life of his earlier works; and this new estimation of nature shows, more significantly than any other factor, his final emancipation from the traditions of the Romanticists.

*Harvard University.*

---

## ROBERT OF GLOUCESTER'S *CHRONICLE* AND THE *LIFE OF ST. KENELM*

BY BEATRICE DAW BROWN

The geographical introduction to the metrical chronicle attributed to Robert of Gloucester includes, as is generally known, a passage of considerable length which is similar to, indeed in great part verbally identical with, lines in the *Life of St. Kenelm* in the *South English Legendary*. Dependence on the part of one or the other author is, of course, to be inferred; but there has not been general agreement as to which was the borrower,—a matter of some interest in that it carries with it the determination of the relative chronology of the two works. The purpose of the present paper is to contribute toward the settlement of this question some hitherto disregarded evidence.

The passage exhibiting similarities occurs as vv. 11-74 of

*Kenelm*<sup>1</sup> and vv. 6-136 of the *Chronicle*;<sup>2</sup> the verbal parallels occur (with variants to be noted later) as *Kenelm* vv. 21-39, 47-66, 69-74, and *Chronicle* 91-110, 115-136. The subject matter is the physical and political geography of England: the length and breadth of the island (*Kenelm* 11-12, *Chronicle* 6-7); the three chief rivers (*Kenelm* 14-18, *Chronicle* 19-26) and the shires and bishoprics assigned to the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (*Kenelm* 21-74, *Chronicle* 91-136). This matter is introduced appropriately enough by Robert<sup>3</sup> in the course of his preliminary description of England, which is based in the main on Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*;<sup>4</sup> it is brought into connection with the narrative of *Kenelm* by the circumstance—repeatedly stressed by the author—that *Kenelm* was, after his father *Kenulf*, King of the March.<sup>5</sup>

The first published opinion in regard to the dependence implied by the passage was expressed in 1881 by Horstmann, whose wide researches in the field of legend-collections entitle his pronouncements to respect. He says:

Diese Sammlung [*Sc. the South English Legendary*] ist im letzten Viertel des 13. Jhdts. in Gloucestershire gedichtet, wahrscheinlich das gemeinsame Werk der Mönche der Abtei von Gloucester . . . Wahrscheinlich . . . war Robert einer der Dichter; seine Chronik zeigt manche Ähnlichkeiten mit der Legendensammlung, aus denen hervorgeht, dass theils er selbst die Legendensammlung für seine Chronik benutzt hat (wie z. B. das Leben Thomas Bekets), theils seine Chronik für die Legendensammlung verworhet ist (so ist die geographische Einleitung im *Kenelm* ein Auszug aus der Chronik).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vita sancti Kenelmi Regis*, printed from MS. Laud 108 by Horstmann, E. E. T. S. 87, pp. 345-355, and from MS. Harl. 2277 by Furnivall, *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1858, pp. 47-57. Citations in the present paper are from the Laud text; the Harleian MS. offers no material variants in the portion under consideration, and line numbers for this portion are the same in both.

<sup>2</sup> Edited first by Thomas Hearne, Oxford, 1724, and in 1888 by William Aldis Wright in the Rolls Series. References in the present paper are to Wright's edition.

<sup>3</sup> It will be understood that the author of the original *Chronicle* is referred to as "Robert" as a matter of convenience.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Wright, *ed. cit.*, Intro., p. xvi.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. especially vv. 2-3, 39-40, 75-76.

<sup>6</sup> *Altenglische Legenden*, Neue Folge (Heilbronn, 1881), Intro., p. xlv.

A few years later the relation between the *Chronicle* and the *South English Legendary* was investigated by W. Ellmer, in a study of the sources of the *Chronicle* published in 1888.<sup>7</sup> His conclusions, based on instances of similarity and verbal parallels offered by several of the legends, are as follows: the *Chronicle* is the borrower in the case of every related legend except *Kenelm*, which contains material drawn from the *Chronicle*; and Robert, although not the author of the other legends, tried his hand at legend-writing in *Kenelm*.<sup>8</sup>

In the same year in which Ellmer's results were published, William Aldis Wright's edition of the *Chronicle* appeared. The exhaustive catalogue of sources given in the preface to this edition includes several items from the *Legendary*, and notably from *Kenelm*:

In the geographical description with which the *Chronicle* (1-28) opens, he [St. Robert] follows Geoffrey; the account of the division of England into shires and bishoprics is substantially taken from Henry of Huntingdon, and here (91-110) occurs a quotation almost word for word from the *Life of St. Kenelm* as given in the metrical *Lives of the Saints*.<sup>9</sup>

Apart from the discussion of Ellmer, for which Horstmann's expressed opinion would seem to have set the key, we have then the unsupported statements of two eminent authorities<sup>10</sup> in head-on collision. In such a case it is of special interest to inquire which had the right of way.

Although antecedent probability may be said to favor the point of view of Wright, rather than a hypothesis which makes *Kenelm*

<sup>7</sup> "Über die Quellen der Chronik Roberts von Gloucester," *Anglia*, x, 1-37 and 291-322. (The first part was also printed independently as an inaugural dissertation, Halle, 1886.) Ellmer made use of Hearne's edition of the *Chronicle* (the Rolls Series edition not having yet appeared), of the texts of *Thomas à Becket* printed by Black (Percy Soc., 1845), and of individual legends printed by Furnivall, *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1858.

<sup>8</sup> *Anglia*, x, 323.

<sup>9</sup> *Ed. cit.*, Introd., p. xvi. The full extent of the parallel, which covers v. 136 of the *Chronicle*, was not observed by Wright.

<sup>10</sup> Professor G. H. Gerould is in agreement with Horstmann and Ellmer in assuming a relationship of mutual dependence between the *Legendary* and the *Chronicle*, but believes that in addition to the geographical matter in *Kenelm*, brief passages in three other *Lives* were taken over from the earlier version of the *Chronicle* (*Saints' Legends*, pp. 160-161).

the exception to an otherwise consistent rule, this somewhat elusive factor should perhaps be excluded from the discussion. Nor can we rely wholly upon internal indications of date in the *Chronicle* and in the *Legendary*, since we have to deal with two works in which several strata of composition are recorded. It is rather the comparison of the metrical passage as it appears in both works with its source which should yield trustworthy evidence, or at least evidence carrying major probability. A brief comparison of the pieces involved is accordingly undertaken herewith.

Let us consider first the lines exhibiting verbal parallel. Ellmer was the first to point out that the source of the inventory of shires and bishoprics in the kingdoms was a passage in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*.<sup>11</sup> For the sake of facilitating reference, the passage is reproduced.

*De partitione regnorum, et pagis et episcopatibus Angliæ.*

§ 99. Dominabantur ergo reges Cantuaritarum proprie in Cantia; in qua sunt hi episcopatus: archiepiscopatus Cantuariæ, episcopatus Ro-fensis.

§ 100. Reges West-Saxonum dominabantur in Wiltescire et Berkensi et Dorsetensi pagis; quibus est episcopus unus, cujus est modo sedes Salesbiria, quondam erat vel Ramesbiria vel Scircburna.

Et in Suthsexa, quae aliquanto tempore habuit proprium regem. Eratque sedes episcopalis ejus pagi antiquitus in Selesco, quae est insula circumflua ponto, ut Beda narrat, ubi etiam beatus Wilfridus monasterium construxit. nunc habitat episcopus apud Cicestram.

Et in pagis Suthamtunensi et Sudreiensi, quibus est episcopus qui habet sedem Wintonia.

Et in pago Sumerssetensi, qui habebat olim apud Welles episcopum, qui nunc est Bathonia.

Et in Domnonia quae Devenescire dicitur, et in Cornubia quae nunc Cornu-gualliae dicitur. Erantque tunc duo episcopatus, unus in Cridentuna, alter apud Sanctum Germanum: nunc est unus, et est sedes ejus Exonia.

§ 101. Porro reges Merciorum dominabantur in pagis his, Glocestrensi, Wigornensi, Warwicensi: in his est episcopus unus, cujus sedes est Wigornia.

Et in Cestrensi, et in Derbensi, Stadfordensi: in his est episcopus unus,

<sup>11</sup> *Anglia*, x, 5. The relation with William of Malmesbury was likewise noted by Karl Brossmann, in a paper presented as an inaugural dissertation (a year later than Ellmer's) under the title "Über die Quellen der mittellenglischen Chronik Roberts von Gloucester," Striegau, 1887.



et habet partem Warwicensis et Scrobbeberiensis pagi, et est sedes apud civitatem Legionum vel Coventriam; quondam erat Lichefeldæ.

Et in Herefordensi, habeturque ibi episcopus habens dimidium pagum Scrobesbiræ, et partem Warwicensis et Glocestrensis, possidens sedem in Herefordo.

Et in Oxenefordensi, Buchingensi, Hurfordensi, Huntendunensi, dimidia Bedefordensi, Northhamtunensi, Legacestrensi, Lincoliensis; quas regit episcopus qui modo habet sedem Lincolæ, quondam habebat apud Dorkecestre.

Et in Legacestrensi, Snotingensi, quorum Christianitas ad archiepiscopum Eboracensem spectat; habebaturque ibi olim proprius episcopus, cujus sedes erat apud Legacestram.

§ 102. Reges Orientalium Anglorum dominabantur in pago Grantebrigensi; et est ibi episcopus, cujus sedes est apud Heli.

Et in Northfolke et Sudfolke; et est ibi episcopus cujus sedes est apud Norwic, quondam erat apud Elman vel Tetford.

§ 103. Reges Orientalium Saxonum dominabantur in Estsexa, et dimidia Hurthfordensi; habebaturque ibi, et habetur, episcopus Londoniensis.

§ 104. Reges Northanhimbrorum dominabantur in omni regione quæ est ultra Humbram fluvium usque ad Scottiam; erantque ibi archiepiscopus Eboracensis, episcopus Haugustaldensis et Ripensis Lindisfarnensis, de Candida Casa: Haugustaldensis et Ripensis defecerunt, Lindisfarnensis translatus est in Dunelmum.<sup>12</sup>

The above material obviously underlies the metrical passage with one change of arrangement; to wit, the possessions of the King of the March (§ 101) are recorded first in the English texts, which give in second place the counties belonging to the West-Saxons (§ 100), and in third those of Kent (§ 99).

Let us now analyse the parallel between the metrical passages which have been regarded as verbally identical. Certain slight differences between *Kenelm* and the *Chronicle* appear when the corresponding lines are arranged in parallel columns.

<i>Kenelm</i>	<i>Chronicle</i>
21-38	91-108
. . . .	109
39	110
40	. . . .
41-46	. . . .
. . . .	111-114
47-49 <sup>a</sup>	115-117 <sup>a</sup>
49 <sup>b</sup> -51 <sup>a</sup>	. . . .

<sup>12</sup> *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. William Stubbs, (Rolls Series). Vol. I, pp. 100-101.

<i>Kenelm</i>	<i>Chronicle</i>
51 <sup>b</sup> -66	117 <sup>b</sup> -132
67-68	. . . .
69-70	133-134
71-72	. . . .
73-74	135-136
	(general similarity)

Of the discrepancies in the above table, we need not be concerned with *Chronicle* 109, *Kenelm* 40, 67-68, or 72, as these lines have nothing in common with the source. Notably different, however, is the case with *Kenelm* 49<sup>b</sup>-51<sup>a</sup> and 71, as these lines in both instances render material in the *Gesta* which is omitted in the *Chronicle*. *Kenelm* 47-51 runs as follows:

þe King of westsex hadde þo· al wilte-schire i-wis  
 And Deorkecestre, and barroke-schire: þat al o bishopriche is,  
 þe bishopriche of salesburi: ake þo nas it so nougt,  
 For þe chief stude of the bishopriche: at schirbourne was i-wrougt.  
 Sethþe hadde þe kyng of west-sex: south-sex al-so.

This is a fairly complete rendering of the first two sentences of § 100 in the material given above from the *Gesta*, whereas 'quondam . . . Scireburnae' is omitted in *Chronicle* 117.—

þe bissopriche of salesburi al souþ sex þerto,—

a line which is obviously a combination of *Kenelm* 49<sup>a</sup> and 51<sup>b</sup>.

The second instance of source material retained in *Kenelm* and omitted in the *Chronicle* concerns § 104. Although the first item, the domain of the king of Northumbria, is reproduced in both metrical passages, the second, its relation to the bishoprics, appears only in *Kenelm* 71:

þe bishopriche of Eouerwik: and of Duyrham iwis.

We may turn now to the four lines occurring in the *Chronicle* (vv. 111-114) for which *Kenelm* offers no equivalent:

Vor þe lond bitwene homber 7 þe water of temese iwis,  
 Ich wene in þe bissopriche of lincolne hit is;  
 And þe bissopriche of lincolne 7 bi weste al pat lond  
 þe King wule of þe march adde al in his hond.

The material rendered in vv. 111-112 is not found in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta*, but in Henry of Huntington's *Historia*

*Anglorum*, in the course of the list of counties and bishoprics which Robert transferred to the *Chronicle* before introducing the partition of the kingdoms:

extenditur enim episcopatus Lincolniae a magno flumine Humbrae usque ad flumen Tamesis.<sup>13</sup>

Vv. 113-114 serve merely to link this information with the context.

A comparison of the verbally similar passages with the source, then, establishes the facts that the author of *Kenelm* derived material directly from the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* of William of Malmesbury, and that Robert made use of the lines in *Kenelm*, in combination with material from Henry of Huntingdon.

It remains to consider the similarities in content, not referable to William of Malmesbury, which occur in the earlier lines of the two poems. These are reducible to two,—a statement of the length and breadth of England (eight hundred by two hundred miles), and the names of the three chief rivers. Before drawing inferences from these resemblances, we may profitably examine the opening lines of the *Chronicle* in conjunction with the Latin materials which underlie them. The statement of Wright, in his introduction is, "In the geographical description with which the *Chronicle* opens, he [*sc.* Robert] follows Geoffrey."<sup>14</sup> In this opinion, however, Wright appears to have been mistaken. It is true that the two details common to the *Chronicle* and *Kenelm* appear also in Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniae*<sup>15</sup> but in all other details of content the *Chronicle* is much closer to Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia*,—the work which was Robert's main dependence for the remainder of the geographical introduction. This is clear from a brief survey of relevant passages in the two works, in conjunction with the *Chronicle*.

Plente me may in engelond of alle gode ise,  
 Bote volc hit vorgulte, oþer ȝeres þe worse be;  
 Vor engelonde is vol inoz of frut ȝ ek of tren,  
 Of wodes ȝ of parkes þat ioye hit is to sen;  
 Of foweles ȝ of bestes, of wilde ȝ tame also

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Thomas Arnold (Rolls Series), pp. 9-10 (Lib. I, § 5).

<sup>14</sup> *Ed. cit.*, Introd., p. xvi.

<sup>15</sup> Ed. San Marte, Halle, 1854.

Of salt fisch ȝ eke verss, of vaire rivers þerto,  
Of wellen swete ȝ colde inouȝ, of lesen ȝ of mede (vv. 9-15).

foecunda frugibus et arboribus, copiosa ravis et nemoribus, jucunda volumina et ferarum venatibus, ferax avium multi et diversi generis terra et mari, et fluviis; . . . alendis autem mira pecoribus et jumentis. . . . Fluvius vero abundat valde piscosis, fontibus praeclara copiosis; . . . abundat et vitulis marinis (Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, Lib. I, § 1).

campos late pansos, collesque praepollenti culturae aptos habet, in quibus frugum diversitates ubertate glebae temporibus suis proveniunt. Habet et nemora universis ferarum generibus repleta. . . . Habet prata sub aeriis montibus amoeno situ virentia, in quibus fontes lucidissimi per nitidos rivos leni murmure manantes, suaves sopores in ripis accubantibus irritant. Porro lacubus atque piscosis fluviis irrigua est (Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Hist. Regum. Britanniae*, Lib. I, Cap. 11).

Again, the list of metals in the *Chronicle*, while not reproducing with exactitude that noted by Henry, is much closer to it than to the general statement offered by Geoffrey. Robert's somewhat sanguine inclusion of 'gold' may be due to a misreading of 'rarius' (possibly contracted) as 'aureum.'

Of seluer or ȝ of gold, of tyn ȝ ek of led,  
Of stel of yre ȝ of bras (*Chronicle*, vv. 16-17).

Venis etiam metallorum aeris redundat, ferri scilicet, stanni, et plumbi nec non et argenti, sed rarius (Henry of Huntingdon, *Hist. Angl. Lib. I*, § 1).

Omni enim genere metalli foecunda (Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Hist. Regum Britanniae*, Lib. I, Cap. 11).

Robert notes also among the products of England

—wolle god, betere ne may be non,—(v. 18)

which was probably suggested by Henry's phrase 'pro mira fertilitate . . . lanae pretiosissimae.'<sup>16</sup> For this, Geoffrey offers no equivalent.

In one detail indeed, the *Chronicle* is closer to Geoffrey than to Henry of Huntingdon,—viz. in naming three English rivers, whereas Henry names only the Thames and the Severn.<sup>17</sup> But in this detail (if for a matter of such common knowledge we need seriously inquire into sources) the *Chronicle* agrees also with *Kenelm*. It is, then, quite possible to explain the first twenty-eight lines of the *Chronicle* as fusing material from Henry of

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid. cit.*, p. 6. (Lib. I, § 2).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* p. 10. (Lib. I, § 6).

Huntingdon and *Kenelm*—the most reasonable explanation, in that it parallels the procedure which, as has been shown, Robert followed in *Chronicle* vv. 91-136.

Finally, if there be any necessity for explaining the presence in *Kenelm* of the numerical statistics, it is at least suggestive to cite a similar list of bishoprics, classified in relation to the Mercian, Danish and Saxon "laws" which stands in Jesus College, Oxford, ms. 29 (fol. 267).<sup>18</sup> This list is prefaced by a statement of the length and breadth of England,—the latter measurement given as three hundred miles. Although supplying, of course, in no sense a source for the metrical passage, this list offers an interesting parallel in usage.

Evidence from source, then, virtually establishes the priority of *Kenelm*. If we return to Ellmer's discussion, we find that he bases his argument for the dependence of *Kenelm* on the greater appropriateness of the geographical material in a political chronicle than in the life of a saint. It would not occur to anyone but the author of the *Chronicle*, in his opinion, to introduce such details in a place where they are not at all relevant and with which they have nothing whatever to do.<sup>19</sup> Without entering into the question whether Robert is the author of *Kenelm*,<sup>20</sup> let us examine the assumption that underlies it, that the geographical material must have appeared first in the *Chronicle* since it belongs more appropriately in that context.

It is true from the point of view of a modern stylist that the material in question sorts better with the *Chronicle* than with *Kenelm*. This circumstance, however, contributes nothing to the argument, inasmuch as the apparent inappropriateness exists, regardless of whether the versifier of the legend derived his material direct from the source or through an intermediary. What is more

<sup>18</sup> Ed. Morris, *An Old English Miscellany*, E. E. T. S. 49, pp. 145-146.

<sup>19</sup> *Anglia*, x, 321.

<sup>20</sup> Ellmer's arguments against the identification of Robert with the author of *Thomas à Becket* and the other legends (except *Kenelm*) would seem to be amply supported by the instances cited by him of dissimilarities in point of view and in versions of historical events. It may be worth noting, as strengthening this point, the opposing attitudes taken by the respective authors in regard to events leading to the Norman conquest. In *Wolfstan*, the conquest is referred to as a national catastrophe; Harold is represented as the rightful heir, who defended his rights honourably

to the point is that the superficial irrelevance may be read as a clearly motivated design. It has been already noted that the material in the *Gesta* is readjusted in the metrical version so that the possessions of the Mercians stand first in the list. There is no conceivable reason why the author of the metrical *Chronicle* should thus disarrange the Latin material, whereas an obvious motive for so doing appears in the case of a poet writing of the King of the March. Another item not to be disregarded is the presence in the *Gesta*, a little above the "*De Partitione Regnorum*," of a brief record of the martyrdom of Kenelm, which is appended to a discussion of the reign of Kenulf. Here we find noted the founding of Winchcombe Abbey 'quae adhuc superest' by Kenulf, and the circumstance that he is buried in the same abbey which he had founded:

Idem monasterium cum magnis redditibus quantum hoc tempore incredibile videatur, ampliasset, vicesimo quarto regni anno funere suo honoravit.<sup>21</sup>

This, it will be noted, is the material with which the opening lines of *Kenelm* are concerned.

Seint Kenelm þe zongue kyng: þat holi martyr is,  
He was king in Engelande: of þe Marche of Walis.  
Kyng kenulf his fader hiet: he was kyng þare also.  
þe Abbeie of wynchecoumbe he liet arere: And þarcinne monekes do,  
And Aftur is deþe he was þare i-bured: and zeot he liith þere  
In þe Abbeize þat zeot stant: þat he him-seolf liet arere.<sup>22</sup>

The order of material, then, in the legend,—the introduction

---

but was betrayed by his followers. (E. E. T. S. 87, pp. 72-73). The version offered by the author of the *Chronicle* (vv. 7268-7281) is totally different; Robert regards William's claims as rightful, and Harold's course of action as treacherous. Again, the author of *Wulfstan* bitterly deplores the fact that kings of alien stock have held the throne since the Conquest: "Unkuynde Eyres zeot huy beoth ore kinges echone"; whereas Robert is at pains to show that the native line was restored by the marriage of Henry I with Matilda of Scotland, a descendant of Edmond Ironside (vv. 6466-6469; cf. Wright, *Introd.*, p. ix). Again in vv. 7250-7257 he refers to Matilda as descended "of þe rizte kunde of engelond," and of her marriage with Henry as joining "kundeliche" England with Normandy.

<sup>21</sup> *Ed. cit.*, pp. 94-95 (Lib. I, § 95). This material is represented in the *Chronicle*, vv. 5156-5159. Six lines are added in the later recension which narrate briefly the martyrdom of Kenelm (cf. Appendix X).

<sup>22</sup> E. E. T. S. 87, p. 345.

followed by the geographical digression,—reproduces that in the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*.<sup>23</sup>

We may further not disregard, in considering the relevance of the geographical material in *Kenelm*, that such a digression into matters of secular interest is not without parallel in the *South English Legendary*. The whole of the so-called "Third Part" of *Michael*<sup>24</sup> is devoted to an explanation of the planetary system, the nature of the elements, the development of the human embryo and other matters much more remote from the original theme than is the case with the geographical passage in *Kenelm*. Again in *Wolfstan*, the poet, after recording the death of St. Edward the King in the fourth year of Wolfstan's tenure of the bishopric of Worcester, gives his version of the events leading up to the battle of Hastings, and discusses the founding of Battle Abbey by William of Normandy.<sup>25</sup>

Virtually no grounds remain, then, for regarding *Kenelm* as dependent on the *Chronicle* of Robert of Gloucester. With Robert proved the borrower in the instance of *Kenelm* as well as in the cases of the other legends showing correspondences, the priority of the *South English Legendary* may be accepted with confidence. Finally, now that we may set aside the somewhat complicated hypothesis of a relationship of mutual dependence between the *Chronicle* and the *Legendary*, we are not compelled to assign the composition of the *Legendary* to the Abbey of Gloucester as the only place where such close literary inter-relationship would have been possible. In other words, the problem of the provenience of the *South English Legendary*<sup>26</sup> is to be approached without initial presumption in favour of the Abbey of Gloucester, as the solution.

*Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.*

---

<sup>23</sup> The material intervening in the *Gesta Regum* between the notice of Kenulf's reign and the list of bishoprics has no bearing on the matter in hand.

<sup>24</sup> Printed by Horstmann, E. E. T. S. 87, pp. 311-322. The Second Part also contains a digression of considerable length on the nature of angels, demons, etc., but this matter has a fairly obvious relation to the theme.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

<sup>26</sup> This question I have discussed in the introduction to an edition of the *Passion* in the *South English Legendary* (now in press) which is to be issued by the Early English Text Society.

## NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

---

### UNWRITTEN WORKS OF FLAUBERT

Aside from works projected in his childhood, of which usually only the titles remain, there are many others referred to in the letters of Flaubert's mature years, some of which he had a passing fancy to write, others that he seriously considered undertaking, but most of which he never even began. He was never satisfied with what he was doing, either in quantity or quality, and was always seeking *the* subject, in full harmony with his temperament, that would allow him to give the full measure of his talent. Such statements as the following show this clearly: "Je n'écirai jamais comme je veux, ni le quart de ce que je rêve" (1853, II, 336).<sup>1</sup> "Je ne fais rien de ce que je veux! Car on ne choisit pas ses sujets, ils s'imposent. Trouverai-je jamais le mien? Me tombera-t-il du ciel une idée en rapport avec mon tempérament? Pourrai-je faire un livre où je me donnerai tout entier?" (1869, III, 542.) These unwritten works are mentioned to friends to whom he was writing, and it is the purpose of this article to point out what he has to say concerning them.

In 1845 Flaubert was thinking of writing a drama on a subject about which he had already written a sketch in his youth, San Pietro Ornano (cf. *Œuvres de Jeunesse*, Vol. 1): "There came to me some days ago the idea of a rather bare drama on an episode of the war with Corsica which I read in the history of Genoa" (I, 161); he asks his friend Ernest Chevalier, then in Corsica, whether he could get some information about Sampiero Ornano and the condition of Corsica from about 1550 to 1650 (I, 169).

When he departed on his oriental trip, he had promised to write some articles on his journey for the *Revue Orientale*, but he says it will have to do without them, as it is his intention to publish nothing for a long time (1850, I, 361).

In 1850 he has three subjects in mind, which are, perhaps, only the same thing: 1) *Une Nuit de Don Juan* (about whom he had already written in "Passion et Vertu," *Œuvres de Jeunesse*, Vol.

<sup>1</sup> These numbers refer to the date the letter was written and the volume and page of the *Correspondance*, Conard edition, Paris, 1910.



1), of which he had thought at the lazaret at Rhodes; 2) the story of Anubis, the woman who wishes to be loved by a god; this is the most lofty, but it has frightful difficulties;<sup>2</sup> 3) his Flemish novel of the girl who dies a virgin and a mystic. What worries him is the relationship of ideas in these three plans: in the first, insatiable love under the two forms of terrestrial and mystical love; in the second, the same story, but terrestrial love is less elevated in that it is more precise; in the third, the two types are united in the same person and one leads to the other, but his heroine dies of religious exaltation after having known the exaltation of the senses. He believes that when one dissects unborn children so well, one is unable to create them (II, 12); he had thought a good deal of the first of these, on his horseback journey, but the theme seems very common and hackneyed and leads only to the eternal story of the nun (1851, II, 49); later, the *Don Juan* is advancing slowly and from time to time he puts some of it into writing (1851, II, 62).

The fancy came to him at different times to write a drama on Socialism; a great Roman novel and a book on the Eighteenth century; a romance of chivalry and a fairy tale; a novel on madness and another on Cambyzes. Socialism alarmed him, and when he returned from the Orient, he wanted to go deep into the Socialists and to write in dramatic form something very brutal and very farcical and of course impartial (1850, II, 12). While reading Juvenal, he passed two hours dreaming of a great Roman novel; his book on the Eighteenth century had come back to him the day before (1853, II, 204). It was one of his old dreams to write a romance of chivalry, which he considers feasible even after Ariosto, by introducing an element of terror and "large" poetry that is lacking in Ariosto (1853, II, 283). "Here is another of my ambitions! To write a fairy tale!" (1853, II, 309). The study of medicine has always attracted him; he is much interested in a course of lectures given by the head of an insane asylum, but he does not attend them, although he has long meditated a novel on madness or rather on the manner in which people go mad (1859, III, 230). When Sainte-Beuve advises him to write of modern things, he says: "Do you know what I am dreaming of now? A

<sup>2</sup> He repeats a few times his desire to write this story; see among others *ibid.*, II, 347, 359.

story of Cambyses. But I reject that dream, I am too old, and then! and then!" (1861, III, 288).

In speaking of critics and criticism he says it is easier to discuss than to understand, and to chatter about art, ideal of the beautiful, ideal, etc., than to write the slightest sonnet or the shortest sentence; he himself would like to take a hand in this and to write at one stroke a book about it all, but that will be for his old age when his ink-well is dry. What a dashing book could be written under the title, "On the Interpretation of Antiquity." It would be the work of a life-time (1852, II, 116). The following year the same idea persists; he would like to be a learned man, to write a fine book on the interpretation of antiquity, for he is sure of being in the tradition; what he adds to it is the modern feeling (1853, II, 213).

The vague outline of a big novel, metaphysical, fantastic and "gueulard" had come into his head some weeks before (1852, II, 140); he had spoken to Bouilhet of his plan, in which a man by dint of thinking comes to have hallucinations, at the end of which the ghost of his friend appears "pour tirer la conclusion (idéale) des prémices (mondains tangibles)"—whatever that may mean—and he finds to his amazement this idea indicated in Balzac's *Louis Lambert* (1852, II, 191). Flaubert's nervous disease, he informs us, had made known to him curious psychological phenomena of which no one has any idea, or rather that no one has felt. He will avenge himself for this some day, by using it in a book, "that metaphysical novel with apparitions, of which I have spoken to you," but as it is a subject that frightens him, he must wait until he is far enough from those impressions to be able to give them factitiously, ideally, hence without danger for himself or the work (1853, II, 230).

Flaubert expected, with Bouilhet, to publish an edition of Ron-sard and to write a preface for it in which he would prove some of his ideas on criticism. In this preface he would relate the history of poetic feeling in France and would give an exposé of what is there meant by that term, the measure in which it is needed, the small change that is required; they have no imagination in France, and if one wants to make poetry acceptable, one must be clever enough to disguise it (1853, II, 215). He is going within two or three years to read again all the French classics and to annotate

them, a labor that will be of use to him for his prefaces, his work on literary criticism; he wishes to prove the insufficiency of the schools, whatever they may be. He will try to show why aesthetic criticism has remained so far behind historical and scientific criticism, they (the critics) *had no base*; the knowledge that they lack is the *anatomy of style*; how a phrase is put together and how it is attached to others; life and love and the soul are absent (1853, II, 358). From the end of the Sixteenth century until Hugo all books, however fine they may be, have an odor of school-dust about them; he repeats his intention of reading again all his French classics to prepare in advance for his "*Histoire du sentiment poétique en France*." Criticism must be written like natural history, with absence of moral idea; it is not a question of declaiming about such and such a form, but of exposing what it consists of, how one kind is attached to another and by what each lives (1853, II, 381).

It seems that Flaubert at times had the idea of writing his memoirs, for he says that some day he is going to write of himself quite at his ease (1852, II, 92); but he later changes his mind; he does not at all feel the need of writing them; his very personality is repugnant to him and immediate objects seem hideous or stupid (1853, II, 336); "The old project that I had of writing my memoirs has left me. Nothing connected with my person tempts me" (1853, II, 346); he had often had this vague fancy, but that must be reserved for his old age, when imagination is dried up (1853, II, 394). He considers that the need is felt for two moral books, one on literature and the other on sociability; he is burning to set about them; he wishes to give a little necessary air to human conscience; this is the time; a crowd of critical ideas are loading him down (1854, II, 440).

While interrupted in writing *Bouvard et Pécuchet* by a trip to Kalt Bad, he was reflecting upon two or three other subjects, still vague, among them a big book in three parts which will be entitled "*Sous Napoléon III*," but when will he begin it? (1874, IV, 218); four years later the story was still in his mind, but the old title had changed: "The subject of the novel *Sous Napoléon III* finally came to me! I think I feel it. Until further orders it will be called *Un ménage parisien*" (1878, IV, 327).

In 1877 it is the Battle of Thermopylae that attracts him:

"More than ever I desire to write the Battle of Thermopylae" (IV, 294), and later he writes to his niece: "Do you know what haunts me now? The desire of writing the Battle of Thermopylae. It is taking hold of me again" (1879, v, 525); he further informs her that he expects to undertake the journey to the scene of the battle when he has finished *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (1879, v, 535).

And, finally, there was an oriental tale, ancient or modern, that Flaubert had contemplated writing for many years. The first mention of this is in 1845: "I am still ruminating my oriental tale that I shall write next winter"; shortly afterward he is going to busy himself with this work, but it is hard; he did not continue his labor upon some Chinese philosopher that bored him, but will take that up again later (I, 161, 174). The next year his oriental tale is put off "à l'année prochaine, peut-être à la suivante, peut-être à jamais" (I, 183), but he is continuing his studies to help him in this tale which he has been meditating for eighteen months (I, 217). In 1853, while busy with *Madame Bovary*, he affirms that he, too, will do something oriental in eighteen months. It will be the antique Orient and done in such a way that the Orient of all these daubers will look like an engraving beside a painting; it is an Egyptian tale that is trotting through his head (II, 277). The earth is beautiful and to think of dying without having seen half of it, without having been drawn by rein-deer, carried by elephants, or in a palanquin—all this he is going to put into his oriental tale—the things he loves will be there, as the things he hates will be in the preface to his *Dictionnaire*;<sup>3</sup> his oriental tale comes to him in puffs, vague odors of it dilate his soul (1853, II, 330, 347). When a friend is traveling in the Orient, he writes to him: "You are now in the surroundings that I should need for my novel on the modern Orient," and Flaubert will take notes on what his friend tells him (1867, III, 460); he later writes to the same person: "Since you are plunged in the modern oriental, think of me for my future novel of *Harel-Bey*" (1868, III, 517). But Flaubert in 1877 had almost given up hope of being able to write his Oriental tale: "A big book on that is one of my old dreams. I should like to write about a civilized man who turns

<sup>3</sup> *Le Dictionnaire des idées reçues*, which became *Bouvard et Pécuchet*.

barbarian and a barbarian who becomes civilized, to develop this contrast of the two worlds ending by mingling with one another. But it is too late. It is like my Battle of Thermopylae. When shall I write it? And *Monsieur le Préfet* and many others" (1877, IV, 318).

OTTO PATZER.

*University of Washington.*

---

### BODMER AND THOMSON'S *SEASONS*

In his *Noah* we find evidence that Bodmer was acquainted with certain works of a number of English authors. Some of his indebtedness to English sources I have previously discussed in several articles which have appeared at intervals in various journals. At this time I wish to point out, merely in a preliminary way, a Bodmerian passage which is obviously indebted to an episode in Thomson's *Seasons*.

Upon the question of possible general influences of Thomson upon Bodmer I am not yet prepared to report. Love of nature, for example, we find in both authors; likewise an interest in the theme of friendship. I feel, however, that it would be premature on my part to conclude that Bodmer must therefore have been indebted to an appreciable or, in other words, demonstrable degree to Thomson in these and several other themes which happen to be common to both men. Here it may be well to remind the reader that Bodmer borrowed freely from many authors representing various European literatures. In view of this fact caution is particularly imperative in an attempt to determine, beyond peradventure, the specific literary influences involved.

As is well known, the principle *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* may, frequently enough, prove a dangerous because illusory one to pin one's faith to. One wonders therefore whether Price in his *English-German Literary Influences* (cf. p. 232) was as critically cautious as he might have been when he suggests—without, however, citing any specific evidence in support of his view—that Bodmer's treatment of friendship, for example, was influenced by Thomson. As a matter of fact, as I have stated elsewhere,

some of Bodmer's most important passages on the subject of friendship were clearly indebted to Young.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, we know that he had a gift for friendship which was quite as truly a natural trait as was his love of literature. And finally, it will be pertinent in this connection to add that he was interested in friendship as a literary theme many years prior to his acquaintance with Thomson's poetry, as is shown by the fact that it is one of the subjects treated in the *Diskurse der Maler*,<sup>2</sup> the little journal which was avowedly an imitation of the moral weeklies of Steele and Addison. But the parallel which I present below represents, I believe, a clear case of Bodmer's direct borrowing from Thomson.

In the *Noah* there occurs a scene where Japhet, who has never before set eyes upon a woman, unexpectedly meets the three daughters of Siphah. This episode, as I have already shown, is derived in part from Dryden's *Tempest*.<sup>3</sup> Certain features, however, were suggested by the summer scene in Thomson's *Seasons* where Damon accidentally comes upon three maidens at their bath in the refreshing stream.<sup>4</sup> Not only is there agreement in the number of maidens who in each case are viewed with interest by the young man, but the two situations as a whole present striking resemblances. In addition to the general correspondences between the two situations, one or two minor parallels with-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article "Bodmer and Young" in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April 1925, pages 211-218. In the same article I refer also to the influence of Klopstock. Cf. also my "Bodmer and Milton" in the same journal (1918), pp. 589-601, where I refer to the theme of friendship in *Paradise Lost*, the epic which Bodmer admired, studied, translated and imitated. In that article I take occasion to refer to the high praise which he bestowed upon Milton's epic. Here I may state that Bodmer was also acquainted with Elizabeth Rowe's *Friendship in Death*. She, as is well known, was an imitator of Milton.

<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere I have had occasion to take issue with Price in other matters. Cf. my article "Bodmer and Young."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article "Dryden's *Tempest* as a Source of Bodmer's *Noah*" in *Modern Philology*, Aug. 1917, pp. 55-61.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Seasons*, edition of 1730, viz., "Summer" ll. 980-1037; the edition of 1744, as well as subsequent ones, contains a different version of the episode. Cf. my article "A German Translation of Passages in Thomson's *Seasons*" in *Modern Language Notes*, April 1911, pp. 107-109.

in the passages may be noted. Bodmer's phrase "mit bebendem Busen" (*Noah*, ed. 1765, p. 10) recalls Thomson's (*Summer* l. 1004 f.)

Nor Paris panted stronger . . . .  
Than, Damon, thou.

Again in the *Noah* we read, page 8,

"Japhet, . . . . welch sanftes Entzucken  
Zog dir die Seel in das Aug . . . . .  
. . . . und ward nicht mit Schauen gesättigt,

which resembles the passage in *The Seasons*

Damon drew  
Such draughts of love and beauty to the soul.  
(*Summer* l. 1031 f.).

That Bodmer was familiar with the summer scene in Thomson's *Seasons* we know from the fact that when in 1745 he brought out an edition of Pyra and Lange's *Freundschaftliche Lieder*, he appended an anonymous German version of the very episode under consideration together with the translation of two others from the same poem. Wieland regarded Bodmer himself as the translator. The same view has been held by others.<sup>5</sup> Some investigators, on the other hand, ascribe the German translation, conjecturally to be sure, to Bodmer's friend Sulzer.<sup>6</sup> But though the actual authorship of the German version still remains a moot question, there can be no doubt as to Bodmer's acquaintance with the particular episode which concerns us here.

It may not be uninteresting in this connection to point out that Bodmer's account of Japhet's meeting with the daughters of Sipsa, which we have just considered, is referred to by Wieland in his *Die Prüfung Abrahams*;<sup>7</sup> this poem, I may add, shows in a striking manner how deeply Wieland at this time (1753) was under the influence of Bodmer. Moreover, in Geszner's *Der erste Schiffer*

<sup>5</sup> So in the *Goedeke Grundriss*, third edition (1907), iv, 1, page 11; so also by August Sauer in the reprint of the *Freundschaftliche Lieder*, page vi (in Seuffert's *Neudrucke*). I confess, however, I am not yet convinced of the correctness of this view.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Theodor Vetter in the *Bodmer Denkschrift*, page 341, and Budde in his *Wieland und Bodmer*, page 138 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Wieland's *Werke*, Hempel edition, xxxix, 404.

we have in the meeting of Melida and the youth an undoubted reminiscence of the corresponding episode in the *Noah*.<sup>8</sup> Also in Bodmer's own *Sündflut* the meeting between Dison and Sunith resembles, in some respects, the scene between Japhet and Siphah's daughters in the *Noah*. In other words, in each of the four German works mentioned above, one is justified in seeing an episodic feature which points back to the summer scene in Thomson's *Seasons*.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

University of Iowa.

### NATHANIEL FIELD AND ROBERT WILSON

Collier has enough already to answer for without adding the charge of murder. Says Mr. Greg in his scholarly review of Dr. Chambers' great *Elizabethan Stage*:<sup>1</sup> "Dr. Chambers has anticipated two conclusions I had reached independently: one that Nathan Field, the actor, was the younger brother of Nathaniel Field, the printer (whom Collier unreasonably murdered in infancy), as well as of the Bishop of Llandaff; the other that there is no sufficient ground for supposing two Robert Wilsons."

That Nathaniel Field, the actor, was the brother of the Bishop of Llandaff we find stated in a letter of May 24, 1619: "Dr. Field (Field, the player's brother), shall succeed Llandaff"<sup>2</sup>—unless indeed the parenthesis is an editorial insertion. There is also good reason to believe that Nathaniel, the actor, was not a brother of the "printer," but was himself the "printer," as Collier supposed. It should first be noticed, however, that while this Field was a stationer, he was not a "printer" as Mr. Greg calls him, but a publisher or bookseller, a very important distinction in those days.<sup>3</sup> At least, Collier's assumption that the elder Nathaniel had died before the younger received the name certainly represents the rule. Collier's alleged "muddle" of the two Nathaniel Fields is further

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Geszner: *Schriften* (Zürich 1818), vol. 1.

<sup>1</sup> *Review of English Studies*, I, 1, 102.

<sup>2</sup> *Court and Times of James I*, II, 167.

<sup>3</sup> Arber, *Transcript*, v, xxix, 235, and references there cited; McKerrow, *Dictionary*, I, 101-2.



cleared up by a knowledge of the law (5 *Eliz.* c. 4) governing apprenticeship at the time, which ordered that one should be apprenticed at least seven years, and should not take up his freedom till the age of twenty-four. This law was observed by the Stationers' Company.<sup>4</sup> Now Nathaniel the publisher took up his freedom June 3, 1611, when Nathaniel the actor was on the eve of twenty-four, but six years tardy for the elder Nathaniel. The fact that we can trace Nathaniel the actor elsewhere during this apprenticeship has little bearing on the matter. Arber<sup>5</sup> records that these apprentices, "though bound to Stationers, were sometimes employed in totally different occupations." As a matter of fact, the apprentice-actors also were not regularly apprenticed to acting. They were regularly apprenticed to the trades of their masters and used by them as actors; or their time was transferred by sale or impressment to others, who used them as actors.

It is significant too that Nathaniel the publisher did not publish so long as Nathaniel the actor continued to act, and that they both in this final period dwelt in Blackfriars, where only one of them is even yet officially buried. Of course, one frequently never exercised the trade to which one was eligible. For instance, Mr. W. J. Lawrence in a recent article<sup>6</sup> infers that because John Heminges was a grocer and Martin Slaughter an ironmonger, they must needs at some time have exercised those trades. We need only record that King James himself is said to have been a grocer,<sup>7</sup> and then let him who will follow Mr. Lawrence's analogy. At least, the records give reasonable ground for the belief that Nathaniel Field, the actor, was also Nathaniel Field, the publisher. We are hardly justified then in adding murder to Collier's accomplishments.

We have also good ground for believing that there were at least two Robert Wilsons. Of the twelve members belonging to the original Queen's company in 1583,<sup>8</sup> only three—Robert Wilson, John Bentley, and Tobias Mills—do not appear in a certificate of

<sup>4</sup> Arber, *op. cit.*, I, xli-xlii; V, xxix.

<sup>5</sup> Arber, *op. cit.*, V, xxix.

<sup>6</sup> *Studies in Philology*, XXI, 592.

<sup>7</sup> Ellis, *Original Letters*, 2nd series, III, 232, note a. King James was a Clothworker, Prince Henry a Merchant Taylor (Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, I, 573-4; II, 132-3, 141).

<sup>8</sup> Wallace, *First London Theatre*, 11.

Lay Subsidies, June 30, 1588.<sup>9</sup> Now Tobias Mills was buried July 11, 1585.<sup>10</sup> Also, as has not previously been pointed out, in August, 1585 John Bentley was the subject of the following burial record at St. Peter's, Cornhill:<sup>11</sup> "19 Thursday John Bentley one of ye Queens players, pit in ye north ile. yers 32." In view of these records for his two missing companions, it seems fairly to be inferred that the actor Robert Wilson by June 30, 1588 was no longer troubled by mundane subsidies, though I have not located either his burial record or his will. Had he been alive, he should certainly have been subject to Caesar's call, along with his nine living companions. This inference finds some confirmation in Heywood's placing Wilson "before my time," though he "must needs remember Tarleton," who was buried in September, 1588. I take it then that Robert Wilson, the Queen's man, was dead some little time before the subsidy certificate of June, 1588; and that the later records belong to other men of the same name. Further, if this actor was also a dramatist, as is regularly inferred, there must then have been at least two dramatists of the name.

T. W. BALDWIN.

University of Illinois.

### WAS DANCOURT A PLAGIARIST?

There has long been a question as to whether or not Dancourt borrowed rather freely from other authors in some of his earlier comedies which he submitted for presentation under his name. The *Mercure* is not definite in some of its notices in reference to Dancourt, saying of *Le Chevalier à la Mode*: "cette comédie a été accommodée au théâtre par M. Dancourt."<sup>1</sup> However, in 1734, several years after the death of both authors named, the *Mercure* published the following statement, the earliest known expression

<sup>9</sup> *Malone Soc. Coll.*, I, 354-5.

<sup>10</sup> Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, II, 330.

<sup>11</sup> Printed Registers Bentley's will (*Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury*, IV, 39) might yield information on the Queen's men.

<sup>1</sup> *Mercure Galant*, Oct., 1687, pp. 377 ff.

of doubt as to the unqualified right of authorship claimed by Dancourt:

" Cette pièce (*Les Bourgeoises à la Mode*) est imprimée sous le nom de Dancourt, cependant elle n'est pas tout à fait de lui; M de Saintyon, premier auteur de cette charmante comédie, s'en est déclaré le père et a revendiqué son ouvrage de manière à faire honneur à celui qui se l'est approprié, puisqu'il a avoué de bonne foi qu'il en devait le succès aux agréments que M. Dancourt y avait répandus et à quelques changements qu'il y avait faits.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately, no authority, other than the reported statement by Saintyon, an almost forgotten author of the day,<sup>3</sup> is given for this assertion, which has been the point of departure for much discussion. Important light on this moot point is furnished by a statement printed in 1696, nearly forty years before the *Mercure's* affirmation of 1734, in a *Satire contre les Faiseurs de Fades Opéra, de Mauvais Livres, et de Sottes Comédies*,<sup>4</sup> where the poet Gacon said of Dancourt:

. . . . ce fier auteur croit être un grand génie,  
Quoiqu'il doive souvent tout ce qu'il a de beau,  
A tel qui lui confie un ouvrage nouveau.  
De ses honteux larcins l'histoire est si publique  
Que je l'ose avancer comme un fait sans réplique.<sup>5</sup>

Even though this hitherto unnoticed passage does not settle the question as to Saintyon's contributions to Dancourt's successes, it does establish the point that, immediately after the presentation of these comedies, it was common talk at Paris that Dancourt indulged in generous borrowings from his contemporaries.

GEO. B. WATTS.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

<sup>2</sup> *Mercure de France*, Nov., 1734, p. 2492.

<sup>3</sup> According to the *Mercure* Saintyon was "Grand Maître des Eaux et Forêts" and "un Philosophe très retiré du grand monde." Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 2502.

<sup>4</sup> *Le Poète sans fard*, 1696, p. 42 ff.

<sup>5</sup> This satire was re-printed in the later editions of *Le Poète sans Fard*.

THE SOURCE OF PEELE'S *ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS*

In the *Modern Language Review* for 1924 there appeared a series of articles by Miss V. M. Jeffery on the Italian and English Pastoral Drama of the Renaissance. The general thesis of the series is that English pastoral dramatists are more indebted to Italian authors than is commonly supposed. The second article (April, 1924) is entitled *The Source of Peele's Arraignment of Paris*. Much of its material is also included in an Italian article by Miss Jeffery in *Nuova Antologia*, March 1, 1925. The present writer is inclined to welcome Miss Jeffery's general estimate of Italian influences, but cannot accept the evidence of her second article.

She presents as Peele's source *Il Giuditio di Paride*, by Anello Paulilli, published at Naples in 1566. On this belief is based her assertion that the English pastoral play under discussion "is not the outcome of a growing native vogue in England, as former critics have wished to prove, but an importation from Italy, executed with great skill. On the *Arraignment* has been founded the whole structure of the existing theories of English critics of pastoral drama. The *Arraignment* must now acquire a new significance." The "vital point" of her study is her proof "that Peele was acquainted with this earlier play." "Would not this evidence of direct imitation in the early stages deal a final blow to the theory of a separate parallel development in England?"

In her proof, Miss Jeffery offers no external evidence that Peele had any acquaintance with Paulilli's work. On the other hand, Paulilli is an obscure author, whose writings were not much circulated. Peele is not necessarily dependent on Paulilli in this case, for he could have received the general idea of pastoral drama from better-known Italian plays, and the story of the Judgment of Paris is a ready-made pastoral, since Paris made his decision when a shepherd on Mt. Ida. Dramatic use of the story is not unique. For example, St. Augustine writes:

De tribus deabus, Junone scilicet, et Minerva, et Venere, quae pro malo aureo adipiscendo, apud judicem Paridem de pulchritudinis excellentia certasse narrantur; et ad placandos ludis deos, qui delectantur seu veris,

seu falsis istis criminibus suis, inter theatricos plausus cantantur atque saltantur (*De Civ. Dei*, 18. 10).

In her parallel passages Miss Jeffery indicates no striking verbal resemblances; there is nothing except the general similarity that would naturally be found in the work of men treating the same theme under somewhat similar conditions. Nor does she give modifications of the story peculiar to the two authors. Even her comparison of the subplots is hardly decisive.

Though Miss Jeffery does not discuss other sources for the *Arraignment*, they are ready at hand. Ovid gives three epistles of his *Heroides* to the story of Paris. One of the striking passages is that in which Oenone tells of the verses carved by Paris on a poplar:

incisae servant a te mea nomina fagi,  
et legor Oenone falce notata tua,  
populus est, memini, pluviali consita rivo,  
est in qua nostri littera scripta memor,  
et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt.  
crescite et in titulos surgite recta meos!  
popule, vive, precor, quae consita margine ripae  
hoc in rugoso cortice carmen habes:  
cum Paris Oenone poterit spirare relictâ,  
ad fontem Xanthi versa recurret aqua (*Heroides*, 5. 21-30).

To this theme Peele frequently refers:

the dittie will agree,

Paris, with that same vowe of thine upon our Poplar tree  
(lines 306-7).

My vowe is made and witnessed, the Poplar will not starte,  
Nor shall the nymphe Oenones love from forth my breathing hart  
(339-40).  
(Oenone entreth with a wreath of poplar on her heade.)  
Beguilde, disdayned, and out of love: live long thou Poplar-tree,  
And let thy letters growe in length, to witness this with mee. . . .  
False Paris, this was not thy vow, when thou and I were one,  
To raung and chaung old love for new (631-8).  
*Mer.* Where woons he than? *Oen.* about these woods: far from  
the Poplar tree.  
*Mer.* What Poplar meane ye? *Oen.* witnes of the vowes betwixt  
him and me.  
And come and wend a little way and you shall see his  
skill (695-7).  
I will gow sit and pyne under the Poplar tree,  
And write my answer to his vow, that everie eie may see (724-5)

It seems unlikely that Peele would have chanced on such a detail as the growing of the inscription without familiarity with the Ovidian story. Miss Jeffery does not indicate any reference to the poplar in Paulilli.

The attempt of the goddesses to persuade Paris by offering gifts is four times alluded to by Ovid:

tres tibi se nudas exhibuere deae,  
unaque cum regnum, belli daret altera laudem,  
"Tyndaridis coniunx," tertia dixit, "eris!"<sup>1</sup>  
nec te Palladios nec te Iunonis honores  
auditis Helenae praeposuisse bonis.  
ergo ego sum virtus, ego sum tibi nobile regnum!<sup>2</sup>  
praeposui regnis ego te, quae maxima quondam  
pollicita est nobis nupta sororque Iovis;  
dumque tuo possem circumdare brachia collo,  
contempta est virtus Pallade dante mihi.<sup>3</sup>

ingentibus ardent  
iudicium donis sollicitare meum.  
regna Iovis coniunx, virtutem filia iactat;  
ipse potens dubito fortis an esse velim.  
dulce Venus risit; "nec te, Pari, munera tangant  
utraque suspensi plena timoris!" ait;  
"nos dabimus, quod ames, et pulchrae filia Ledae  
ibit in amplexus pulchrior illa tuos!"<sup>4</sup>

This outline is developed by Peele, somewhat as Tennyson later developed it in his *Oenone*. Venus' belittling of the other gifts in the last passage furnishes about the only characteristic detail. Peele takes it up when Venus says in beginning her speech:

These bene to hoate alarams for thee (516).

Perhaps it also appears in Paris' defence before the court of heaven (1019 ff., quoted by Miss Jeffery, p. 184). This, however, is a conventional strain in praise of the simple life. Something of Venus' argument in Ovid also appears in Paulilli (quoted by Miss Jeffery, p. 183). Other reminiscences of Ovid perhaps appear in Peele, as "Ida vales" (26) from "Vallibus Idae" (*Her.* 16. 53). (But cf. Ἰδαίαν νάπαι (Euripides, *Andromache* 275).

<sup>1</sup> *Heroides*, 17. 116-8, Helen to Paris.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 133-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Heroides*, 16. 165-8, Paris to Helen.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 79-86.

Early in life Peele made a translation of one of the *Iphigenias* of Euripides; which one is unknown, for the work is lost. But he can hardly have been unfamiliar with the one he did not translate, as well as with other plays by Euripides. In the *Iphigenia at Aulis* (1300-9) is a passage on the judgment, in which the goddesses are characterized, and it is also alluded to in the *Andromache* (275-89), the *Helen* (23-29), and the *Hecuba* (643-5). One of the scholia on the last tells of the inscription on the apple, translated by Peele "Detur pulcherrimae" (*Arraignment* 392). This inscription is not mentioned by Ovid. It is, however, found in the form "hoc est donum deae pulcherrimae" in the comment by Servius<sup>5</sup> on what is probably the best-known reference to the judgment of Paris in any classical author, *Aeneid* 1. 27. The same scholium also tells of the gifts promised by the goddesses, namely, royal power, success in war, and the beauteous Helen. But though Peele doubtless knew some of these passages, he does not always follow Euripides. The Greek speaks of Hermes as taking the goddesses to the judgment, while Peele and Ovid do not mention his presence, though Paulilli apparently does (*M. L. R.*, p. 184).

Moreover, Peele tells the story of Paris in his *Tale of Troy*, written a few years before the publication of the *Arraignment*. The knowledge there shown is sufficient to account for his familiarity with Trojan story independently of Paulilli.

The evidence just presented covers almost everything in the mythological part of the *Arraignment* which Miss Jeffery attributes to the influence of Paulilli, and is perhaps sufficient, when combined with a knowledge of one or more of the pastoral dramas accessible in England, such as the *Aminta*, to account for Peele's work. Though Miss Jeffery's paper is of service in showing the similarities between English and Italian pastorals, and hence in leading students to search for Italian influence on English writers, it cannot be said to prove the vital point that "it is impossible to imagine that Peele cannot have known the earlier Italian version of the story" of the Judgment of Paris. To be sure, a possibility that he knew of Paulilli still remains, but a remote possibility does not enable us to say that "the *Arraignment* must

<sup>5</sup> In the ms. known as Parisinus 1750.

now acquire a new significance" in the history of the English pastoral drama. Nevertheless, it seems probable that by methods other than the search for direct sources the inspiration of the English mythological pastoral may be shown to have been derived from Italy.

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

*Duke University.*

---

IL EST POURTANT TEMPS, COMME DIT LA  
CHANSON. . . . .

On lit dans *Le crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* la phrase suivante : "Quand on est très vieux, il devient extrêmement difficile de disparaître : *il est pourtant temps, comme dit la chanson, de prendre ma retraite* et de songer à faire une fin."

Les deux éditions annotées du roman d'Anatole France que nous avons sous les yeux—celles de Charles H. Wright (Holt & Co.) et de J. L. Borgerhoff (Heath & Co.) expliquent de façon identique le passage que nous avons souligné : "Allusion to the *Stances sur la Retraite* of Racan (seventeenth century) : Thirsis, il faut penser à faire la retraite, etc."<sup>1</sup> Les commentateurs sont d'accord pour faire rapporter "comme dit la chanson" non pas à la proposition qui précède "il est pourtant temps," mais à celle qui suit "de prendre ma retraite." C'est donc l'idée de *retraite* qui a guidé leurs recherches et les a conduits tous deux au poème de Racan.

Que faut-il penser de cette explication ? On peut d'abord s'étonner qu'Anatole France—à supposer qu'il ait eu dans l'esprit ce vers de Racan—n'ait pas conservé l'expression "faire la retraite" dont le parfum archaïque ne pouvait que lui plaire, et qu'il ait par surcroît qualifié de *chanson* un poème qui n'en est point une. Il faut sans doute chercher une autre interprétation. Dans la phrase qui nous occupe, ce qui frappe d'abord le lecteur accoutumé à l'écriture parfaite d'A. France, c'est la succession des syllabes "tant temps" dont la répétition amusante, mais fâcheuse, ne pouvait que frapper désagréablement l'oreille du maître styliste. Les chansonniers n'ont point, eux, de ces scrupules ; au contraire. La juxtaposition de syllabes identiques : "ton ton, ton taine et ton

<sup>1</sup> Wright, éd. de 1904, p. 265. Cf. Borgerhoff, p. 133, éd. de 1920.



ton" est un élément familier des rondes enfantines et des refrains populaires. La parenthèse "comme dit la chanson" pourrait alors être interprétée comme une excuse d'A. France, peu soucieux d'assumer la responsabilité d'une tache de style.

Cette interprétation est en partie confirmée par le fait que la phrase en question se trouve à deux reprises dans les œuvres d'Alfred de Musset. On lit en effet, dans *Une soirée perdue*, vers 37-44:

Puis je songeais encore. . . . .  
Que c'était une triste et honteuse misère  
Que cette solitude à l'entour de Molière,  
Et qu'il est *pourtant temps*, comme dit la chanson,  
De sortir de ce siècle ou d'en avoir raison;

et dans la deuxième des *Lettres de Dupuis et Cotonet*, datée du 25 novembre 1836: "il serait *pourtant temps*, comme dit la chanson, de savoir ce que parler veut dire."

Ces deux passages, où Musset a pris soin de souligner lui-même "pourtant temps," nous permettent de conclure (a) de façon certaine—qu'on ne saurait séparer ces deux mots de "comme dit la chanson," ainsi que l'ont fait les commentateurs du *Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*; (b) avec vraisemblance—que la phrase d'A. France n'est qu'une réminiscence du vers d'*Une soirée perdue*, poème beaucoup plus connu que les *Stances* de Racan.

Il reste maintenant un point à éclaircir: quelle est la chanson dont parle le poète? Dans ses *Morceaux choisis* d'A. de Musset (Didier, Paris, 1917), M. Joachim Merlant avoue qu'il n'a pu la retrouver. Il déclare (p. 463): "Je ne sais à quelle vieille chanson Musset fait allusion; il fait comme Alceste qui chantait la vieille chanson du roi Henri, d'origine inconnue, mais adaptée au goût du 17ème siècle." Nous l'avons nous-même longtemps cherchée en vain avant de poser la question dans *L'Intermédiaire des chercheurs et des curieux* qui nous a apporté deux réponses qui se confirment. Nous reproduisons intégralement la mieux documentée, celle de M. Pierre Dufay (*Intermédiaire* du 20-30 juin 1925):

"Il est *pourtant temps*—Peut-être était-ce, chez Alfred de Musset, un souvenir de la Bonnaventure du Gué du Loir, lorsqu'enfant il y passait ses vacances, traçant du manoir à demi ruiné un croquis que reproduisit la revue régionaliste d'Hubert Fillay,

*Blois et le Loir-et-Cher.* La chanson a cours dans le Blésois, car, s'éloignant de Vendôme, on en a recueilli cette version à Menars, résidence presque royale où la Marquise de Pompadour, puis son frère, Marigny, succédèrent aux Charron :

Il est pourtant temps, pourtant temps, ma mé,  
 Il est pourtant temps de me marier.  
 Ma fille, nous n'avons point d'argent (*bis*)  
 Ma mé, nous avons du froment;  
 Que ne le vend-on et ne me marie-t-on?  
 Il est pourtant temps, pourtant temps, ma mé  
 Il est pourtant temps de me marier.  
 Ma fille, nous n'avons point d'habit (*bis*)  
 Ma mé, nous avons des brebis,  
 Que ne les tond-on et ne me marie-t-on?  
 Il est pourtant temps . . . etc.  
 Ma fille, nous n'avons point d'amant (*bis*)  
 Ma mé, nous avons le gros Jean,  
 Que ne le prend-on et ne me marie-t-on?  
 Il est pourtant temps . . . etc.

“ Cette chanson n'est pas spéciale au Blésois et au Vendômois. M. Adolphe Orain, dans ses *Chansons de la Haute Bretagne* (Rennes, Hyacinthe Caillière, 1902, in-8, pp. 269-271), en a reproduit une version presque analogue, dont il fournit la musique.

“ A la Bibliothèque Nationale, le *Recueil* manuscrit des *Poésies populaires de la France*, en reproduit une autre, originaire des Ardennes (VI, 87) et il n'est pas jusqu'aux Alpes—c'est au surplus le propre de la chanson populaire—où cela ne se soit chanté . . . (Julien Tiersot, *Chansons populaires recueillies dans les Alpes Françaises*, Grenoble, H. Falque et P. Perrin; Moutiers: François Dueloz, 1903, in-4, p. 302).”

On trouvera cette chanson reproduite dans la série *Les Poètes du terroir* publiée par Ad. Van Bever (Delagrave, 1922, 2e édition, pp. 18-19). M. Van Bever déclare d'ailleurs qu'il en doit lui-même la communication à M. Dufay, qui termine sa réponse dans *L'Intermédiaire* par cette conclusion :

Il est vrai que le thème est éternel, comme aussi celui des désillusions auxquelles nous devons “le Maumariée.”

On ne saurait mieux dire. Ainsi se trouve parfaitement élucidé cet intéressant petit point d'histoire littéraire.

MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN *ZITARIE*, *ZITTERIE*.

The history of the German word *Zither* (designating the musical instrument) presents an interesting little problem. The word, evidently of Persian origin (< Pers. *sihtâr*, = three-stringed) <sup>1</sup> passed through the Greek and Latin languages into Old High German, where the foreign form was preserved: *cithara*, *zilhara*, or at most mildly altered: *an dero zitherun*, Notker, *Ps.* 32, 2. At the close of the Old High German period a second borrowing from Latin took place, this time through the medium of the Old French *citole*, appearing in Middle High German as *zitöl*, *citöle*.

None of the dictionaries record the existence of the older form of this word in Middle High German, and following after them Kluge states in his latest edition: <sup>2</sup> "*dem Mhd. fehlt dies Wort.*" The question arises whether Kluge's statement is not too sweeping. The fact that the New High German *Zither* apparently goes back to the Old High German *Zithara* seems to justify the inference that this older borrowing was never so completely replaced by the younger borrowed form as German lexicographers have to date believed. Either we must assume that alongside of the more common M.H.G. form *zitöle* the older form of the word persisted to form the *nexus*, or that in the N.H.G. period a third borrowing has taken place. A single instance from M.H.G. literature would seem to validate the first assumption. And this evidence is, in fact, available, in the M.H.G. epic, the *Jüngere Titarel* (ca. 1272). Peculiar difficulties involved in the proper correlation of the many existing and corrupted manuscripts of this epic have thus far unfortunately hindered the appearance of a critical edition with a restored text. This fact has held scholarly investigations of the epic pretty much in check, although considerable philological treasure lies buried here. As an instance of the existence in M.H.G. of the word form in question, attention is invited to stanza 6078 of the Hahn edition of 1842:

Und als der fvrste rîche.  
Ist varnde nach ablazzen.  
Das tut er demutlicliche.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Heyne, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*,<sup>2</sup> Leipzig, 1906, 1445.

<sup>2</sup> *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*<sup>10</sup>, Berlin, 1924.

Veintlich hazzen ist von im verwazzen.  
 Rotten harpfen zimbeln vnd zitterie.  
 Vil svizzer done klengen.  
 Fvrt man vor im vnd ovch vor sin herie.

Other mss. of (Zarncke's) Group I record the same word, although with a slightly different orthography. Thus Nr. 2675 (National-Bibliothek, Wien), and IV b, 106 a (Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, Breslau) have *zitarie: herie*. On the other hand, the mss. of Group II, as far as I have ascertained, use a different rhyme-word. Thus the print of 1477 (Huntington Library, San Gabriel, California), *psallere: here*; Fol. 1476 (Preussische Staatsbib., Berlin), *spalterie* (corrupted): *here*; ms. IV, F 88a (Staats- und Universitäts-Bib., Breslau), *psalterie: herie*; ms. 3041 National-Bib., Wien), *psalterie: here* and ms. II 76 (Badische Landesbib., Karlsruhe), *psallerie: herye*.

CLAIR HAYDEN BELL.

*University of California.*

## THE UNBLEMISHED GARMENTS IN *THE TEMPEST*

It is satisfactory to find common sense and a knowledge of practical playwriting coming forward in the person of Professor Graves to check Mr. Colin Still's symbolic interpretation of the freshened garments in *The Tempest*. (*MLN.*, XL, 396.) Whatever value Mr. Still's study has—and for me it has a great suggestive power in its connection of Shakespeare's theme with enduring and universal race-tradition—yet “deliberate allegory” in the whole and in certain details (here Mr. Still, p. 238, moves with caution) cannot be accepted. Far from being inexplicable, as Mr. Still suggests, except as a symbol, the unspotted condition of the garments can be accounted for, as Professor Graves urges, by dramatic decorum and the triumph of one stage convention over another. But certainly this practical solution is not the full one; the complete explanation of the doublets not only dried but “new dyed” and “fresher than before” leads us back into the mystery of *The Tempest*. This is not, however, the “mystery” of which Mr. Still writes, but rather the magic of that isle in which

not only bedraggled clothes and a battered ship are changed into something rich and strange, but also selfish men are miraculously made over into their proper selves "when no man has his own." In the realistic and satiric scene in which the change is remarked upon, the insistence on the marvel comes from Gonzalo, who is at the same time tedious and yet always sensitive to the miracle of the island. A poet's sense of wonder-working air, quite as much as a dramatist's desire to clarify an obvious absurdity, has moved Shakespeare to reiterate "the rarity of it, . . . indeed almost beyond credit, . . . that our garments being, as they were, drenched in the sea, hold notwithstanding their freshness and glosses."

HELEN SANDISON.

Vassar College.

---

#### SCOTT'S DILEMMA

In the introduction to his *Chronicles of the Canongate*, in 1828, Scott referred to his "late lamented" friend Erskine as one who "reviewed with far too much partiality the *Tales of My Landlord*." The article in question appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, January, 1817, and has generally been regarded as the work of Scott's own pen, because Lockhart included it in the *Miscellaneous Prose Works* of 1835, with a subjoined footnote stating that Murray, the publisher of the *Quarterly*, had the manuscript, and that it was almost entirely in Scott's handwriting.<sup>1</sup> Scott's declaration to John Murray of his intention to write such a review is worth noting; but the final evidence is Murray's "Register" of the authors of articles in the *Quarterly*, where this review is assigned to Scott, Erskine, and Gifford, the implication being that most of it was written by Scott.<sup>2</sup>

What then can have been Scott's motive for practically denying the authorship of the review?

<sup>1</sup> Scott's *Prose Works*, Edin. 1835, xix, 1, and note. Lockhart's *Life*, N. Y., 1914, iii, 83. Compare *Quarterly Review*, xvi, 430.

<sup>2</sup> See Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends*, i, 471, note. The assignments of Murray's "Register" may be found in the appendix of my *Tory Criticism in the Quarterly Review*, N. Y., 1921.

Apparently, at this time he found himself in a curious dilemma. From 1814 until the publication of the review in 1817, he fully expected to continue his "incognito"—as he called it—until the end. He told Morritt so definitely. Whatever he did of this kind (the novel) he should "whistle it down the wind, and let it prey at fortune."<sup>3</sup> Some of the precautions employed to maintain secrecy are described in the general preface of the 1829 edition of the novels. His virtual denial that he had any pretensions to the toast of the Prince Regent—a toast "to the Author of Waverley"—at the dinner given by his Royal Highness to Scott in 1815, is well known.<sup>4</sup> He persistently deceived Lady Abercorn from 1816 to 1824; and, writing to Maria Edgeworth in 1818, he stoutly denied that he was the novelist.<sup>5</sup> In the instrument by which he transferred his copyrights to Constable in 1819, Scott had a clause included, binding them never to divulge the name of the "Author of Waverley" during his lifetime, under a penalty of £2000.<sup>6</sup> He remained unmoved even by the scholarly letters published in 1821 by one "Adolphus," who analyzed the novels which had appeared, and showed them to be, beyond a reasonable doubt, the work of the poet who wrote *Marmion*.<sup>7</sup> From this time there could be no further real secrecy, and—as Lockhart notes—Scott seems to have worn his mask more carelessly. Yet as late as 1825 we find him denying outright the authorship of the novels.<sup>8</sup> Finally, in 1826, the derangement of Constable's affairs, and the consequent publicity given them, put an end to the masquerade.

Of course there was little mystery concerning the identity of the "Author of Waverley" after 1820, while some twenty of Scott's friends were let into the secret before this.<sup>9</sup> But it is easy to believe that when he wrote the review of the *Tales* in 1817, Scott was under the impression his anonymity could be strictly and in-

<sup>3</sup> Lockhart, *Life*, N. Y., 1914, II, 331, 335.

<sup>4</sup> Lockhart, *Life*, II, 520.

<sup>5</sup> *Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, Edin., 1894, I, 381, 390, II, 191; and II, 16.

<sup>6</sup> Lockhart, *Life*, III, 249.

<sup>7</sup> *Letters on the Author of Waverley*, London, 1822. See also Lockhart, *Life*, III, 483-499.

<sup>8</sup> Lockhart, *Life*, IV, 92 and 291.

<sup>9</sup> See *General Preface to Waverley Novels*, edition of 1829, p. 19.

definitely preserved. Why he insisted on it, has never been fully explained, in spite of his discussion in the preface of the 1829 edition. Be that as it may. Scott had written a long and appreciative estimate of his own work, a fact which was known to Murray and to a few others of the *Quarterly* group with whom Scott was on intimate terms, but not to the general public. Obligated to acknowledge the toast of Lord Meadowbank to the "Author of *Waverley*," at the famous dinner in 1827, Scott then found himself in an embarrassing dilemma. So he admitted what could no longer be denied, and shortly afterward, in the Introduction to the *Chronicles of the Canongate*, alluded to William Erskine as the author of the review. Erskine had written articles on politics, but as far as can be learned almost nothing on literature. Murray, the publisher of the *Quarterly Review*, and others connected with it, could of course be relied upon to remain discreetly silent, strict anonymity being a policy of the periodical.

In conclusion, it is not hard to see Scott's reason for disclaiming responsibility for the article which probably did more than any other to advance his reputation as a novelist—the first wholly favorable criticism of his novels in the *Quarterly Review*.<sup>10</sup> Very soon after the famous dinner, at which he was forced to admit the authorship of the *Waverley* novels, came an opportunity to deny in print the writing of the review. Both William Erskine and William Gifford, who had been editor of the *Quarterly* when the article appeared, were conveniently dead. Scott probably felt that the embarrassing position in which he found himself was sufficient justification for his prevarication.

WALTER GRAHAM.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

<sup>10</sup> John Wilson Croker, who reviewed the first three "*Waverley*" novels, failed to understand the novelist's method or appreciate his talent. Probably Croker was not taken into the secret of authorship. At any rate, Scott appears to have been dissatisfied with the notice he was getting in the *Quarterly*, and told Murray he wished to review the next novel.

A NOTE ON SAMUEL DANIEL'S *CIVILE WARS*

The first five books<sup>1</sup> of Samuel Daniel's *The Civile Wars Between the Two Houses of Lancaster and Yorke* were entered on the Stationers' Register October 9, 1594, and published by Symon Waterson in 1595. In these five books, which deal with English history from the deposition of Richard II to the conspiracy of the Duke of York against Henry VI, the poet develops elaborately the theme of righteous retribution or Nemesis by which he accounts for the devastating wars and dissensions characteristic of England at this time. Daniel states that Henry IV committed a great sin by usurping the crown from Richard II and for that sin not only Henry IV, himself, but his grandson Henry VI and his countrymen suffered punishment. The theme is expanded with all its moral implications throughout the first unit.

Then in 1599 Daniel published in the *Poeticall Essayes* a sixth book<sup>2</sup> in which he continues the events of the reign of Henry VI. During this book there occurs a curious passage<sup>3</sup> in which, although the figure of Nemesis is concretely referred to, the poet has apparently confused the idea of righteous retribution with predestinated evil. Nemesis, seemingly at some time in the far past, has looked into the future of England and has decided that many things must happen there before the country is ready for the glorious reign of Elizabeth. Seeing that England must be purged by fire, Nemesis sends Pandora to Britain with her famous box of troubles and has her loose them on the island. These "troubles" consist of all manner of things: religious dissensions, the new learning, the printing press, artillery, and political quarrels. Among the latter are the factions of the Houses of Lancaster and York, the poet's chief theme, and the sin of Henry IV. In other words, Henry's crime, for which Nemesis duly punishes him and his country, *was ordained by an outside force over which he had no control*. It is clear that Nemesis is playing two rôles: that of predestinator as well as avenger. Henry was punished because of a crime which he was predestined to commit.

<sup>1</sup> These five books were first arranged as four.

<sup>2</sup> By the first arrangement this book was number five.

<sup>3</sup> Grosart ed., II, 225-233.



The passage arouses curiosity not only because it gives to Nemesis the new rôle of predestinator, but also because it obviously is a digression from the clear narrative of the poem. In the first place, a discussion that accounts, as this passage does, for the origin of Henry IV's crime should, by all the laws of narrative construction, come early in the story at the time when he committed his sin, instead of appearing two generations later. In the second place, when it does finally appear, it breaks violently into the immediate narrative, separates two closely related events, and quite awkwardly intrudes upon the "plot."

It may be said that Daniel found a source for this digression in the following stanza in the poem on Henry VI in *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559):

Thus of our heavy haps, chiefe causes bee but twayne,  
Whereon the rest depend, and under put remayne:  
The chiefe the will devine, calde desteny and fate,  
The other sinne, through humour's holpe, which God doth highly  
hate.<sup>4</sup>

And it may be contended that that stanza alone is sufficient to account for the inclusion of the passage at this point, for Daniel undoubtedly read and re-read the *Mirror* for suggestions and may have caught the full philosophical significance of the idea of pre-ordained evil only at this time. And yet it seems strange that familiar as he must have been with the *Mirror* he did not develop the theory of predestinated sin earlier in the narrative where it logically belongs.

I think that the difficulty can be solved by realizing that in the first five books the poet was chiefly interested in the idea of righteous retribution or Nemesis and that he had not intended to touch the subject of the source of sin or predestinated evil at all. He completed this first section and had it published early in 1595. Then he set to work at once on the next part and was busy with his narrative when certain religious dissensions of 1595 drove forcefully home the idea of predestination. Seeing the significance of the discussion, he inserted the passage in question.

These religious arguments which I believe inspired the passage culminated in the Lambeth Conference of 1595. Since the middle

<sup>4</sup> II, 219. (1815 ed.)

of the sixteenth century there had been many disputes over predestination and reprobation, over the question of whether God fore-ordained sin or merely fore-knew it. The Anglicans had adopted the Calvinistic view. In 1595 two famous divines, Peter Baro, a Cambridge professor, and William Barret of Caius College had preached vigorously against predestinated evil and had so threatened the Calvinistic theory included in Article XVII of the XXXIX Articles that Archbishop Whitgift called a council at Lambeth Palace including the Bishop of London, the Dean of Ely, Tindal, and others and drew up a document known as the Lambeth Articles, in which nine propositions attempted to show that God predestinated sin.

Here, it seems to me, lies the secret of the predestination passage in Daniel. His first five books dealing with Nemesis were already off the press; he was undoubtedly writing his sixth book just during or just after the Lambeth Conference, where the issue of predestination was clearly defined, and so with the theory fresh in his mind wrote the passage, incorporating the accepted Calvinistic view thinly veiled in classical terminology.

JOHN HAWLEY ROBERTS.

*The University of Chicago.*

### "HIPPOCRATES' TWINS"

In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 313, I quoted two English allusions to "Hippocrates' twins," or the "twins of Hippocrates" (Lyly's *Euphues*, ed. Bond, II, 77; Milton, *Eikonoklastes*, xxi), and suggested that they are due to St. Augustine, *City of God*, v, 2. Let me now offer a third, from George Chapman, *The Gentleman Vsher*, Act iv, sc. 3:

And like the twins *Hypocrates* reports:  
 If he fetch sighes, she draws her breath as short:  
 If he lament, she melts her selfe in teares:  
 If he be glad, she triumphs, etc.

W. P. MUSTARD.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

SIR JOHN DENHAM AND *PARADISE LOST*

But few literary anecdotes have come down to us of Sir John Denham, who was regarded in the court of Charles II as one of the leading wits and poets of the day. The most interesting of these anecdotes is that which makes him one of the first admirers of *Paradise Lost*. Its original source was John Richardson's *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost*, London, 1734, where we find it in the following form:

Sir George Hungerford, an ancient member of Parliament, told me, many years ago, that Sir John Denham came into the House one morning with a sheet, wet from the press, in his hand. What have you there, Sir John? Part of the noblest poem that ever was wrote in any language, or in any age. This was *Paradise Lost*. However, 'tis certain the book was unknown till about two years after, when the Earl of Dorset produced it. Dr. Tancered Robinson has given permission to use his name, and what I am going to relate he had from Fleet Shephard, at the Grecian Coffee-house, and who often told the story. My Lord was in Little Britain, beating about for books to his taste. There was *Paradise Lost*. He was surprised with some passages he struck upon dipping here and there, and bought it. The bookseller begged him to speak in its favour if he liked it, for that it lay on his hands as waste paper. (Jesus!) Shephard was present. My Lord took it home, read it, and sent it to Dryden, who in a short time returned it. 'This man,' says Dryden, 'cuts us all out and the ancients too.'<sup>1</sup>

Edmund Malone was the first to point out the improbability of this account. In 1800, in his *Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of Dryden*,<sup>2</sup> he argues as follows: 1. It is very unlikely that Denham should have had a proof-sheet of *Paradise Lost*; these are seen only by the author, or his intimate friends, and there is no evidence of any connection between Denham and Milton; 2. When *Paradise Lost* was going through the press, Denham was mad; 3. Denham was never in Parliament; 4. Richardson tells us that Denham's praise had no stimulating effect on the sale of the book, since, two years after, it was "waste paper"; yet we can prove that by that time most of the edition had been sold. According to his agreement with his publisher, Milton was to re-

<sup>1</sup> Richardson, *Explanatory Notes*, etc., cxx.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I, part i, 112.

ceive a second five pounds when 1300 of the 1500 copies of the first edition had been sold. He had already received this sum before the date of the Earl of Dorset's visit to the bookshop. This fact cannot be reconciled with Richardson's previous statement that the edition was "waste paper." The whole account, therefore, concludes Malone, is inconsistent, and unworthy of credit.

The discussion is continued by Masson, in his *Life of Milton*,<sup>3</sup> Masson begins by quoting Richardson, and continues by analysing Malone's arguments. Malone, he says, is somewhat too critical; that while it is true that Denham was never in Parliament, still, as he had recovered from his madness by August, 1667, when *Paradise Lost* appeared, Malone's objection on the ground of Denham's insanity loses its force. Masson continues:

But for the rest one must agree with Malone, and suppose that there was some confusion of memory on the part of the old Parliament man, Sir George Hungerford, when he told the story of Denham to Richardson, or on Richardson's part in recollecting what Sir George had said. Even if we waive the question of the place . . . How can we account for his (Denham's) being before all the rest of the world in having access privately to the proof sheets of a forthcoming book by such a political recluse as Milton? And how was his remark so ineffective, the celebrated Sir John Denham though he was, that the book received no benefit from his vast admiration, and its merits had to be re-discovered and re-proclaimed two years afterward? In short the first part of the tradition given by Richardson will not cohere with the second part.

Masson then discusses this second part, concerning the Earl of Dorset and Dryden, and succeeds in giving a plausible explanation for the difficulties found there. His conclusion is, therefore, that since the two parts do not agree, and since the second can be better established than the first, the first must be given up, and the story of Denham's early recognition of the greatness of *Paradise Lost* rejected. And there the matter has rested.

I am not so ready to abandon Denham's claim to literary discernment. Let us examine once again the objections that have been made to his share in this tradition, ignoring the second part, that concerning Dryden, as irrelevant to our purposes. The objections are as follows: 1. Denham could not have seen a proof-sheet; 2. He was mad at the time of the publication of *Paradise Lost*;

<sup>3</sup> VI, 628 ff.

3. He was not a member of Parliament; 4. His praise could not have helped the sale of the book as would have been natural. Passing over, for the moment, the first argument, let us consider the second. That Denham was mad at the time of the appearance of *Paradise Lost* Masson himself disproves, and further evidence may be found in the official records of the period. Denham had resumed his duties as Surveyor General by June, 1667.<sup>4</sup> The third objection, that he was not a member of Parliament, is also groundless. He was returned a member of Parliament for Old Sarum in 1661.<sup>5</sup> The fourth, that the praise of as famous a man as Denham, did not help the sale, is stressed by Masson, who, curiously enough, does not see that he at once answers his own objection. Masson says, that as 1300 of 1500 copies had been sold, the bookseller, when he spoke of *Paradise Lost* as "waste paper," must have meant merely that the copies in his own shop had not been sold. If we thus explain away the "waste paper," we at the same time remove the objection that Denham's praise had no effect on the sale. We see that *Paradise Lost* had sold comparatively well, and that Denham might have contributed to this success.

Of the four objections, therefore, only one remains, that Denham could not have seen the proof-sheets of the poem. In this connection it would be well to examine the original source once again: "Sir John Denham came into the House one morning with a sheet, wet from the press, in his hand. What have you there Sir John? Part of the noblest poem that ever was wrote," etc. We observe at once that proof-sheet is nowhere mentioned, and that this meaning has been read into the passage by the commentators. It is quite true that this is the most natural interpretation; "sheet," and "a part of" seem to imply a proof-sheet; it is also true that the arguments against Denham's having seen a proof-sheet are sound. Yet there is, I think, a simple explanation of the difficulty. Assuming, as does Masson, that some inaccuracy has crept into Richardson's account, may it not have been this? Sir George Hungerford referred not to a proof-sheet, but to an early copy of the first edition of the complete poem. If we accept this conjecture, the difficulties vanish. There is no reason why Denham, in his right mind, and a

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1667-8*, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Parliament, 1878. House of Commons Accounts and Papers*, vol. 62, part 1, p. 531.

member of the House, should not have brought into Parliament a copy of *Paradise Lost* "wet from the press," and praised it; and as Sir John was a famous literary figure, there is no reason why his praise may not have been instrumental in causing the sale of 1300 copies of the poem within two years.

We should not overlook the fact, moreover, that *Paradise Lost* was a poem that would very naturally arouse Denham's enthusiasm, since its high moral theme was similar in character to his own literary didacticism. We must conclude, therefore, that, while it cannot be proved that Denham was one of the earliest admirers of *Paradise Lost*, there is nothing in the tradition as it has come down to us that makes it impossible, or even unlikely, that this was indeed the case.

THEODORE H. BANKS, JR.

*New Haven, Conn.*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Milton, Man and Thinker*, by DENIS SAURAT. New York, Lincoln MacVeagh, 1925.

This volume is much more than an attempt on the part of its author to give wider currency among English readers to the ideas embodied in his French thesis for the *doctorat ès lettres*.<sup>1</sup> It contains, in addition to the earlier material, the fruits of subsequent investigations which have from time to time appeared in the form of special articles. Without altering his exposition of the development of Milton's ideas out of the data of his personality and experience, or abandoning his enthusiasm for the Miltonic system as something permanently valid, M. Saurat no longer makes a claim for its uniqueness. The added material consists chiefly of an account of its sources in what had earlier seemed its most individual features. These sources M. Saurat finds mainly in the body of Jewish mystical writings known as the *Zohar*.

The book as a whole is certainly the best that has been written on the intellectual fabric of Milton's work. It embraces, as any study of the thought of Milton as distinct from his style and imagination must do, the prose and the poetry impartially. It sets forth the coherent body of principles which lies behind Milton's pronouncements on public questions and his interpretation of the fall and restoration of man, in modern philosophic terms. For M. Saurat Milton's God is the Absolute; the eternal plan of wisdom is interpreted as an expression of the latent possibilities of the Infinite in finite being; the Fall is passion, the fruit of the freed possibilities of the Infinite which has become finite; Christ is intelligence, evolved in the creative process, dominating passion; the Resurrection is the ultimate incorporation of the finite into the Absolute.

That Milton's system is capable of such a conversion is proof that he did not merely parrot an inherited theology, adorning it here and there with such eclectic heresies as happened to suit his temperament or to have been suggested by the intellectual contacts of his time, but grappled with it philosophically, endeavoring

<sup>1</sup> *La pensée de Milton*, Paris, Alcan, 1920.

to construct a pattern of reality in Christian terms and to make it coherently applicable to all the aspects of experience. This fact should always have been obvious, and would have been, had the *De Doctrina Christiana* been studied with the attention it deserves. Macaulay was quite right in saying that this document revealed a "powerful and independent mind, emancipated from the influence of authority, and devoted to the search for truth." He was equally right in saying that in a few more days it would follow the *Defensio Populi* to the dust and silence of the upper shelf. To have drawn it thence and employed it thoroughly in illumination of the less systematic expressions in Milton's other work, has been a service of the highest order. Whether M. Saurat's interpretations are in every case sound and whether Milton really is, as he proclaims him, a first class thinker, must be left to the historians of philosophy. It is, I believe, high time that professional philosophers should devote some attention to Milton and pronounce authoritatively on these matters.

The present reviewer, while professing himself unable to pass upon the worthiness of Milton's abstract system to enter into comparison with those of a Calvin or a Spinoza, is in hearty agreement with M. Saurat as to the interest and vitality of his ideas in their applications to the problems of life and conduct; but he cannot dissociate these ideas from their concrete imaginative embodiments. Milton's tremendous expressive power is one of the great facts about him; the other is his humanity. It is in the major poems that these elements coexist in their utmost intensity. In the *De Doctrina* they are in abeyance and whatever high values this work may have, they are not the specifically Miltonic values. M. Saurat is not unaware of this, but it cannot be denied that his work as a whole places its emphasis on things that do not represent the real significance of Milton. His cosmos interests us after all primarily as a theme of his pictorial imagination. His true philosophy is a philosophy of life. It is for this reason that the expository elements in *Paradise Lost* have a less permanent value than those in *Paradise Regained*, *Samson Agonistes*, and the mature sonnets. The former are largely speculative and theological; the latter are the direct comment of Milton's ethical idealism and religious faith on the actual experiences of men.



In his account of Milton's personality and of the effect of his outward and inner life in moulding his views and supplying the elements of conviction and personal intensity which were necessary to convert them into the materials of poetry, M. Saurat writes with brilliancy and persuasiveness. The last vestiges of the Massonized Milton of 19th century tradition are dissipated, the mask of puritanism is pierced, and Milton's inner nature—egocentric, temperamental, passionate—stands revealed. With the analysis of the psychological effects of Milton's clash with his environment, the explanation of much of his mental activity as an endeavor to secure in the ideal world of the imagination triumphs and satisfactions which were denied him in the world of sense and of events, the writer of this review is in general agreement. Some of the detail seems questionable. When M. Saurat, for example, adopts Mark Pattison's suggestion of the cause of Milton's difficulty with Mary Powell as lying in her refusal to consummate the marriage, he is on very dubious ground. Personally, I find nothing to substantiate this in the divorce tracts or elsewhere, and much that is directly against it. We really know far too little of Milton's first matrimonial venture to presume to interpret his inner experience in the light of it.

In his chapters on Milton's external sources M. Saurat has entered on a field immense in its scope and beset with difficulties. There is, on the one hand, the history of the myth—its groundwork in Hebraic and Patristic writing, its embellishment through a long succession of literary treatments in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Exhaustive treatment of this subject is impossible and Saurat does not pretend to deal with it comprehensively. He does, however, besides reviewing the formation of the story of the fall of man and angels, call attention to new material of importance in the apocryphal book of Enoch, the direct influence of which on Milton he firmly establishes.

But M. Saurat is not much interested in Milton's debt to literary tradition for imaginative detail. He emphasizes mainly his relation to his authorities on points of philosophical interpretation. It is in this connection that he makes far reaching claims for the *Zohar* as a primary source of Milton's thought. There is much that is plausible in the idea of Milton's knowledge of this strange work. He was certainly interested as early as the Horton period

in the kindred mysticism of Hermes Trismegistus. He was more than a novice in Rabbinical lore. The *Zohar* was, as M. Saurat shows, if not quite on the highroad of seventeenth century lore, at least not far from it, and its permeation of the writings of the English mystic Robert Fludd (1574-1637) brings it rather near to Milton. There is, however, no direct evidence of Milton's use of it and the problem must await a complete survey of his intellectual relations with the whole body of speculation—Neo-Platonic, Hermetic, Cabalistic—of his own day, together with a more exact definition of his thought in its relation to ancient philosophy, particularly Stoicism, and to all the varieties of theological heresy and spiritual religion. Milton has already been proved a Quaker (Sampson), a Boehmenist (Bailey), a follower of Ochino (Wood), a disciple of Servetus (Larson in a forthcoming study), and now a Cabalist! It is easy to show a kinship with each of these phases of thought, but hazardous to claim the paramount importance of any one.

With regard to M. Saurat's specific parallels the reviewer must content himself with expressing doubt as to their validity in certain important points. The incident of Eve's jealousy, which at first sight seems to be conclusive evidence of borrowing, has been shown by Harris Fletcher<sup>2</sup> to occur in an almost identical form in the Jewish history of Josippon, a work to which Milton explicitly refers. The other concrete parallels are too vague to be of service without this one. It is not, however, on such details that M. Saurat would rest his case, but on a more fundamental identity of philosophic idea. The chief doctrine in question is the interpretation of creation as a retraction of God from a portion of the universe, thereby liberating its latent impulses. This idea M. Saurat had already singled out in his first edition as the kernel of Milton's thought. It was the philosophical explanation of free will in a pantheistic system and Milton's chief title to rank as an original thinker.

The fact that M. Saurat had so formulated the doctrine before he found it in the *Zohar* naturally seemed to him a strong point in his case. The idea is certainly in the *Zohar*, though how prominently one cannot determine from the quoted passages. But is

<sup>2</sup> "Milton and Josippon," *Studies in Philology*, xxxi (1924), 496.

the status of this principle in Milton precisely as M. Saurat represents it? In the *De Doctrina*, which represents Milton's reasoned system, retraction plays no part, and the passage in *Paradise Lost* on which Saurat bases his argument is, I am convinced, susceptible of no such far reaching interpretation as he gives it. Milton is describing, not the orderly universe including man, but the state of chaos as a sort of unreclaimed part of universal being. It is from this portion that God retires. Creation, on the other hand, results from the exercise of his virtue upon a part of chaos. It cannot, therefore, be characterized as retraction but the very opposite. Even, however, if the parallel is not exact it remains striking, and I would by no means affirm that my reservations close the case for Milton's employment of the *Zohar*. It is the merit of M. Saurat's work to have opened here a new field of Milton inquiry. In the completeness of his demonstration, on the other hand, of the relation of Milton's soul-sleeping doctrine to the teachings of the contemporary sect of mortalists he has left little for the gleaners.

J. H. HANFORD.

*University of Michigan.*

---

*An Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic.* By HELEN MCMILLAN BUCKHURST. Methuen and Co., London, 1925.

The author, in her Preface, points out that "those students who wished to include Icelandic in their course of study have been greatly hampered by the fact that no Grammar of the language has been written in English, and that they have therefore been obliged to have recourse to German and Scandinavian works on the subject." She adds, not without pathos, "this is naturally a discouragement." Another discouragement is that these foreign Grammars "are hardly suitable for a beginner, whose main object is to secure sufficient knowledge of the inflexions and syntax of the language to be able to read its texts." Miss Buckhurst has therefore attempted to provide a Grammar elementary enough to suit the most Anglo-Saxon of students. As she tells us, "the greater part of the space is devoted to a detailed treatment of the inflexions and of such points of syntax as are likely to cause difficulties. I have endeavoured to include in the lists of examples only such words as the beginner is likely to come across in the course of his reading.

The phonological study of the language does not come within the scope of such a book; those points only have been given, briefly summarized in the introductory chapter, which have a direct bearing on the inflexions."

The book is divided into nine chapters. The introductory chapter of seven pages gives a little elementary information about the Icelanders, their history, language and literature and the like, but most of the space is devoted to a description of the Old and Modern Icelandic sound system (with an explanation of the workings of umlaut or "mutation"). Chapter II, Nouns, covers 17 pages; it begins, illogically but conveniently, with the definite article! The material in the chapter is well organized; the beginner ought to have some explanation, however, of terms like "strong" and "weak," which might well puzzle him if he had never met them before. Chapter III, Adjectives, runs to six pages; Chapter IV, Pronouns, to 10; Chapter V, Numerals, to six. The next 23 pages are devoted to adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. The last chapter, 17 pages long, is given over to verbs. The whole is concluded with two pages of bibliography and an excellent index.

One can say without hesitation that the author has made a good job of it. The little book will serve admirably the purpose for which it is designed. Miss Buckhurst wisely steers clear of both historical and comparative grammar; her treatise is strictly descriptive, and, accompanied by a text like Craigie's *Easy Readings in Old Icelandic*, ought to suffice for an introductory course in the subject. The book is unattractively bound, but well printed.

Johns Hopkins University.

KEMP MALONE.

*Les Epitaphes de Ronsard*, par MARGARET DE SCHWEINITZ. Paris:

Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1925. xv + 180 pp.

Il y a plaisir à rendre compte d'un ouvrage comme celui de Margaret de Schweinitz sur les *Epitaphes de Ronsard*, parce que les éloges à adresser l'emportent de beaucoup sur les réserves à faire.

Le sujet, proposé par le professeur français H. Chamard, offrait de réelles difficultés. Il s'agissait de montrer la formation du recueil des *Epitaphes* tel qu'il apparaît dans la dernière édition des *Œuvres* publiées du vivant de Ronsard, celle de 1584; de réunir les renseignements historiques sur chacun des bénéficiaires de ces épitaphes et de rappeler les relations qu'ils ont pu avoir avec le poète et qui expliquent la genèse des pièces; de montrer jusqu'à quel point on peut se fier à leur véracité; d'analyser littérairement

les variétés du genre, l'építaphe narrative, l'építaphe morale, l'építaphe badine; de rechercher leurs sources d'inspiration, leurs mérites de style et de versification; de prouver le perfectionnement de leur forme, attesté par de nombreuses variantes: de déterminer enfin la place de l'œuvre tumultueuse de Ronsard dans l'histoire de ce genre, traité par les anciens, les poètes néo-latins, les Rhétoriciens français et les Marotiques.

L'auteur a rempli ce programme avec une abondance de documents, une méthode et un esprit critique qui lui font grand honneur. La conscience qui a présidé à l'élaboration entière de son étude n'est pas moins remarquable: alors que tant de travailleurs intellectuels ont une tendance à s'appropriier les découvertes d'autrui, M. de Schweinitz ne manque aucune occasion de les rappeler et s'empresse de donner les références exactes aux moindres publications dont la sienne a profité.

Rien, d'ailleurs, ne lui a échappé des travaux antérieurs qui pouvaient éclairer son sujet; elle a consulté les plus récents comme les plus anciens, les manuscrits comme les imprimés, et renvoyé son lecteur même à des ouvrages futurs, dont elle escomptait l'utilité, tels que le *Ronsard et son temps* de P. Champion, la *Bibliographie ronsardienne* d'A. Pereire, la thèse d'Hélène Harvitt sur Hugues Salel.

Enfin, ce qui est également très méritoire, elle n'a jamais cherché à surfaire son héros, ni même dissimulé ses erreurs et ses défauts; son livre éclate de franchise autant que de modestie. Avec la défiance et le doute dont elle fait constamment preuve à l'égard des témoignages y a-t-il de meilleurs garants de la valeur de ses investigations?

Parmi ses trouvailles, il en est quelques-unes d'un intérêt particulier que je tiens à signaler. C'est elle qui a révélé (p. 10) l'existence probable d'une építaphe de Ronsard en l'honneur du poète vénitien Navagero, non recueillie dans ses *Œuvres*.—Elle a également donné (p. 25) la seule explication de ce fait que Ronsard a écrit plusieurs építaphes pour Louise de Mailly, dont la principale parut en 1555 et les autres seulement en 1559; je dis les autres, parce que ce n'est pas une, mais trois qui ont paru à cette dernière date, et trois courtes, parmi lesquelles le cardinal Odet de Coligny eut à choisir celle qu'il fit graver sur le tombeau de sa demi-sœur. Elle a cité (p. 27) des strophes où Salmon Macrin, comparant Arthuse de Vernon à la nymphe Aréthuse, rappelle le mythe du fleuve Alphée amoureux de cette nymphe, et a ainsi indiqué un nouveau motif d'inspiration puisé par Ronsard dans les œuvres de ce poète néo-latin, car il a fait le même rapprochement dans son építaphe d'Arthuse de Vernon. Elle a identifié (p. 29) le Le Fevre auquel s'adresse Ronsard dans la première de ses építaphes d'André Blondet.—Dans une longue note

des pages 71-73, relative aux vers que Ronsard a écrits sur la mort de Charles IX, elle a fait des rapprochements très curieux avec l'Histoire de la vie de ce roi écrite par l'évêque Arnaud Sorbin.

Enfin elle a remis au jour une pièce de 78 vers, attribuée à Ronsard par le généalogiste André du Chesne, mais à Jodelle par l'historien Le Laboureur, pièce qui m'avait échappé lors de l'élaboration du tome VI de mon édition in-8° des *Œuvres* de Ronsard; c'est l'Épithaphe de Gabriel de Montmorency, 4me fils du Connétable, tué à la bataille de Dreux en 1562. Il est vrai que le professeur E. Roy la publiait de son côté dans la *Revue d'Histoire littéraire* d'octobre-décembre 1924. Mais, outre que la thèse de M. de Sch. était imprimée quand parut cet article, E. Roy n'a pas su qu'il y avait là une question d'authenticité, soulevée par Le Laboureur et reprise au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle par le bibliophile E. Tricotel; il n'a pas douté un seul instant de la paternité de Ronsard. M. de Sch. au contraire a longuement exposé le problème, avec les raisons qui militent en faveur de l'attribution à Ronsard, et je loue hautement la façon dont elle a conduit la discussion. Comme elle semble, tout à la fin, me demander mon opinion, je la dirai très simplement: en 1562, aucun poète de la Pléiade (Ronsard encore moins que les autres) n'aurait écrit des vers à rimes plates non alternées, comme le sont les vers 17 à 22 et 43 à 46 de cette pièce; si toutefois, dans la hâte du moment, Ronsard les avait rédigés ainsi, contrairement à ses principes et à toute sa pratique depuis 1550, il eût fait aisément disparaître ce défaut de versification, pour les incorporer à ses *Œuvres*; je conclus qu'il n'en est pas l'auteur.

M. de Sch. pose deux ou trois autres questions, auxquelles je me fais un plaisir de répondre:

P. 17, note 3, à propos de l'esprit dans lequel Ronsard a composé son Épithaphe de Rabelais, esprit qui lui semble hostile, elle ajoute: "Après quelque hésitation, Ronsard la supprima de ses *Œuvres*; ne faut-il pas voir dans ce fait une preuve qu'il la jugeait d'un ton démesuré?" Oui, Ronsard jugea qu'il avait dépassé la mesure et maladroitement imité les épigrammes de l'Anthologie grecque sur Anacréon; et il retrancha ladite épithaphe précisément par crainte qu'on ne l'interprêtât mal, comme cela n'a pas manqué d'arriver au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, quand on eut pris connaissance des premières éditions. C'est un argument de plus en faveur de l'opinion que j'ai toujours soutenue de la sympathie de Ronsard pour Rabelais. Pp. 26, 27, M. de Sch. se demande pourquoi Ronsard a écrit l'épithaphe d'Arthuse de Vernon. Aux raisons qu'elle propose et qui sont toutes acceptables, il faut ajouter que la mère de cette jeune femme, Anne Gouffier de Boisy, dame de Montreuil-Bonnin par son mariage avec Raoul Vernon, avait dirigé la maison de Madeleine de France en Ecosse, dont faisait partie Pierre de Ron-

sard en qualité de page. C'est avec Madame de Montreuil (comme on l'appelle dans les Papiers d'Etat de l'époque) que le futur poète revint en 1538 d'Ecosse en France par l'Angleterre, et ce séjour d'un an dans un pays étranger dut créer des liens assez étroits entre le page et la grande dame.

Voici maintenant un très petit nombre de rectifications nécessaires. 1) Jean Brion est mort dans les trois premiers mois de 1555 (v. mon *Ronsard poète lyrique*, p. 136, n. 6) ; il convient donc de lire cette date, au lieu de 1554, à la 5e ligne de la page 3 et à la 2e ligne de la page 9. 2) Les trois épitaphes en faveur de Louise de Mailly que M. de Sch. a réunies en une seule à la page 3, sous le no. XXI, ont paru dès 1559 dans le *Second livre des Meslanges*, recueil rarissime, dont le contenu vient de nous être révélé par Seymour de Ricci dans son *Catalogue d'une collection unique des éditions originales de Ronsard* (London, Maggs, 1925). 3) C'est à tort que Blanchemain et Marty-Laveaux ont fait figurer dans leurs éditions de Ronsard, comme une œuvre à part, un quatrain *Sur la mort du roy Charles IX*, que M. de Sch. signale à la page 8, note 9. Ce sont simplement quatre vers qui font partie de sa deuxième *Responce* aux vers de ce roi. J'ai découvert cette erreur seulement en élaborant l'édition de ses *Œuvres* in-8° (Paris, Lemerre), et je l'ai signalée dans les *Notes*, au tome VII, p. 354. 4) A la page 59, M. de Sch. semble reprocher à Ronsard de ne pas avoir écrit d'épitaphe pour son émule Du Bellay. Mais il a fait mieux : il l'a placé parmi les Immortels dans son *Élégie à Louis des Masures*, composée au lendemain de sa mort (1560), et lui a prêté un discours admirable du fond des Champs Elysées, comme il l'avait fait en 1554 pour son propre père et comme il le fit encore pour le grand capitaine François de Lorraine en 1563. Cette "prosopopée" d'outre-tombe est le plus bel hommage qu'il pouvait lui rendre.

Ces réserves n'enlèvent rien aux mérites de la thèse de M. de Sch. que j'ai présentées plus haut et qui peuvent se résumer ainsi : érudition opportune et féconde, ordonnance logique, critique prudente, conscience et modestie. Le volume se termine par un recueil de documents justificatifs, une bibliographie suffisante et un index des noms très complet.

PAUL LAUMONIER.

Université de Bordeaux.

JOHN KOCH, *Geoffrey Chaucers Canterbury-Erzählungen nach Wilhelm Hertzbergs Übersetzung neu herausgegeben*. Mit 26 farbigen Tafeln. Berlin. (*Alte Erzähler neu herausgegeben unter Leitung von Johannes Bolte. Dritter Band.*) Herbert Stubenrauch Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925. pp. 46, 579.

James Russell Lowell published in his *Literary Essays*, Vol. III, Boston, 1897, an essay on Chaucer, written in 1870.<sup>1</sup> It was a review, and among the books noticed was W. Hertzberg's translation of the *Canterbury Tales* printed at Hildburghausen in 1866, and reprinted by the Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig and Vienna in 1870. In the course of his article Lowell speaks of Hertzberg's introduction as "one of the best essays on Chaucer yet written."

Hertzberg was one of the wonderful line of German gymnasia directors who find time from their arduous school duties to devote to literary research. He was born at Halberstadt in 1813 and died at Bremen in 1879. He devoted himself largely to editions and translations of the Latin poets, but found time to translate some plays of Shakespeare and some of Tennyson's poetry. His most important work, outside of Latin, was the translation of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, which, after the editions of 1866 and 1870, went out of print.

It was then a happy thought for the enterprising and enlightened publisher, Herbert Stubenrauch of Berlin, to reprint Hertzberg's translation in the series *Alte Erzähler neu herausgegeben unter Leitung von Johannes Bolte*, and to entrust the preparation and revision of the new edition to John Koch, one of the most distinguished and prolific Chaucer scholars living, himself also an *Oberlehrer* in a gymnasium near Berlin.<sup>2</sup> He states his attitude to his predecessor in his preface. The text is based on Koch's edition of 1915, which follows in the main as to the order of the tales and the numbering of the lines, the edition of Tyrwhitt which was used by Hertzberg.<sup>3</sup> Twenty-six of the miniatures in the

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to recall that Lowell published at Cambridge in 1844 (2d edition, 1846) a volume, not reprinted in his *Complete Works*, entitled *Conversations on some of the Old Poets*. Two of the *Conversations* are devoted to Chaucer, and deal exclusively with Chaucer's literary side. The *Essay* deals largely with Chaucer's relations to the literatures of France and Italy, which may be supposed to have influenced his own work.

<sup>2</sup> Besides an enormous number of contributions to the study of Chaucer published in the technical journals of Germany, England and America, Koch is the author of an admirable edition of the *Canterbury Tales* for the use of students printed at Heidelberg in 1915.

<sup>3</sup> Hertzberg says, p. 8, of his first edition, Hildburghausen, 1866, that he used Tyrwhitt's text printed in 1852. I do not find any edition of that



Cambridge and Ellesmere mss. are reproduced in colors from the Chaucer Society publications. It may be said that the volume is beautifully printed and is a worthy companion to the other two volumes of the series; Bolte's edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, 1824, reviewed by me in *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1924, pp. 314-316; and January, 1925, pp. 46-49.

Miss E. P. Hammond in her *Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, p. 210, says, in speaking of Tyrwhitt's edition of Chaucer and his discussion of the sources: "The subsequent investigations of the Chaucer Society have accumulated a mass of analogues, largely French and Oriental, to some of the Tales; and the sources of the Clerk's and the Man of Law's Tales have been more exactly treated than by Tyrwhitt. But in the 160 years which have elapsed since he worked, no more definite source has been found for the stories of Merchant, Reeve, Miller, Shipman, Friar, Summoner, Manciple, Franklin, or Squire than was known to him; and while many details have been noted, e. g., regarding the tales of Melibeus and of the Second Nun, it is a striking fact that the investigation of the last ten years has done as much to modify the additions of Tyrwhitt's successors as to impugn the work of Tyrwhitt. Cp. the work of Miss Petersen on the Nun's Priest's Tale and the Parson's Tale, superseding the discussions by Skeat."

Of all these subsequent investigations the first work of Miss Petersen is, in the opinion of the reviewer, the most interesting and suggestive. She says, p. 97, n. 3, "Chaucer's indebtedness to example-books offers an interesting field for speculation, for these collections often contain the substance of his tales if not his immediate model." She then mentions several analogues of the Tales

date. There is one printed by Routledge in 1853. I am indebted to Harvard College Library for the loan of a copy of Hertzberg's translation and have compared it with Koch's edition and can say that so far as introduction and notes are concerned, Koch's edition is substantially a new work. Hertzberg's edition was remarkable for its day and well deserves the praise bestowed upon it by James Russell Lowell, and may still be consulted with profit. Many of the longer notes, e. g., p. 578, on the constellation of the Ram; p. 582, on the position of the Monk in his abbey; p. 586, long note on the Parvis; pp. 598, 644, long notes on the canonical hours of the day; pp. 612-617, long notes on the *Gesta Romanorum*, etc., have been condensed or omitted by Koch for economy of space. Besides these notes there are many others on the characters in the Tales and on the sources of the stories. I shall return to this subject later. Koch has supplied some *lacunae* left by Hertzberg in his translation in deference to the taste of his day. How great has been Koch's task may be seen from the fact that he has used the immense amount of material published since 1866, the date of Hertzberg's edition. The Chaucer Society was founded in 1868, and since then the output of Chaucer material has been steady and great. Koch's edition now renders this material accessible to the general reader and scholars will find much, especially in the notes on the sources of the tales, which will be comparatively new to them.

found in the collections of *exempla* current in Chaucer's time. Since the date of Miss Petersen's monograph, 1898, a large number of collections of *exempla* have been printed in whole or in part. The most important of these I have reviewed in *The Romantic Review*, Vol. VI, No. 2, April-June, 1915, pp. 219-236, and in a paper read in April, 1917, before the American Philosophical Society on *Mediaeval Sermon-Books and Stories and their Study since 1883*.

How enormous is the mass of new material may be seen from the fact that Mr. J. A. Herbert in his *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Vol. III, 1910 (reviewed by me in *Modern Philology*, Vol. IX (1911), pp. 225-237), analyses one hundred and nine manuscripts and refers to over eight thousand stories, many of which have, of course, been frequently reprinted. The largest of the new collections recently printed appeared just at the outbreak of the Great War and has not received the attention it deserves. I refer to Joseph Klapper's *Erzählungen des Mittelalters*, Breslau, 1914, the twelfth number of *Wort und Brauch*, published by the *Schlesische Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*. A few years before the same scholar published in Hilka's *Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte*, 2, Heidelberg, 1911, a smaller but equally valuable collection: *Exempla aus Handschriften des Mittelalters*. I reviewed both of these works in *Modern Philology*, Vol. X (1913), pp. 302-316, and *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XXXII (1917), pp. 26-40.

Let us glance for a moment at one of the *Canterbury Tales* mentioned by Miss Petersen as belonging to the class of *exempla*, the *Pardoner's Tale*. The story is not found frequently in *exempla* and here are some welcome additions to the number already known: Herbert, *Cal.* III, p. 660 (184), Additional 27336, of Italian origin, "Legitur in vita beati Bartolomei"; p. 693, Additional 11872, also of Italian origin; p. 711 (26), Harley 3938, also of Italian origin. "Legitur in vita beati Bartholomei." Klapper, *Erzählungen*, p. 351, No. 157, "Legitur in vita beati Bartolomei"; *Exempla*, pp. 71, 72, Nos. 97, 98. It is an interesting fact that the mss. just mentioned are of Italian origin, and that the Life of Saint Bartholomew is cited as the source of the story. Usually Saint Peter is one of the companions of the Lord in his mythical journeys. I have not been able to find any version of the life of Saint Bartholomew referred to in the mss. cited above. As the oldest Western version of the story is the one in the *Cento novelle antiche* it is permissible to assume that Chaucer got his story from some Italian version, possibly, an oral one.

Of the other tales which Miss Petersen connects with the *exempla*-books may be mentioned the Friar's Tale, which is found in Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Libri Miraculorum*, edited by Meister;

the *exempla* versions (Herolt, Bromyard, Wright's *Latin Stories*, and Pauli) are later than Chaucer, see Professor Archer Taylor's excellent paper in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. xxxvi, No. 1; the Nun's Priest's Tale, found in Bromyard; the Prioress's Tale ("Jew Boy") is found in numberless mediaeval versions, see my recent edition of Pez's *Miracles of the Virgin*; the Franklin's Tale and the Squire's Tale contain certain elements of magic (moving the rocks, the magic horse, ring, and sword) widely found in mediaeval romance, although not in any *exemplum* proper. How easy it is to add to the versions already known may be seen from the paper of Professor Taylor just cited, and from such recent works as Bolte's edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*. Doctor Koch gives an admirable condensed account of the Sources and Analogues of the Tales, citing the latest works on the subject.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

*Sainte-Beuve*, by LEWIS FREEMAN MOTT. New York: Appleton, 1925.

Whether Sainte-Beuve stands in relation to other critics as Homer in relation to other poets, as Matthew Arnold insisted, or whether he is merely, in Taine's phrase, one of the five or six most useful servants of the human mind produced by France in the nineteenth century, he commands the attention of scholars, and especially wherever there may be danger of *la fichomanie*, since one of the critic's chief gifts is his power of correlation, his genius for "making of mere concatenation a current." One should be most grateful to Professor Mott for the opportunity he affords of intimate acquaintance with the master in the field of which Anatole France prophesies: "La critique est la dernière en date de toutes les formes littéraires; elle finira peut-être par les absorber toutes."<sup>1</sup>

Sainte-Beuve's works would make, in a definitive edition if there were any, some thirty or forty large volumes, and Professor Mott in the generous five hundred pages in which he follows his man from 1804 to 1869 analyses the bulk of this material. As an appendix to Chapter VI he gives "a summary analysis of *Port-Royal*," a twenty-five page résumé of that *magnum opus*,—and it must be admitted at once that this for readers of any category is of questionable utility, since whoever wants the general contents of *Port-Royal* or seeks discussion of a particular will find the *table*

<sup>1</sup> *Vie Littéraire*, I, v.

*des matières* in each volume and the *Table alphabétique et analytique des matières et des noms* (volume VII of the third edition) sufficient, and since any reader who wants more must go to the text. Professor Mott also summarizes himself; at the beginning of each of the fourteen chapters (already enumerated with some detail in the table of contents) is a page or more of fine print announcing principal points. In the circumstances a reviewer hesitates to give a recapitulation in his turn, lest one be too many degrees removed from reality.

What is the reality of Sainte-Beuve? Only the rash would attempt a formula, although according to the at once cautious and acute Renan, himself so given to *nuances*, Sainte-Beuve, however unwilling to enclose his theory of the universe, did attain a "deep philosophy which underlies all his judgments."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand a downright and distinguished American critic calls him, repeating what is less a formula than the denial of any, "the wandering Jew of the intellectual world."<sup>3</sup> Surely here is the essential Sainte-Beuve problem. This sensitive artist, with unique gift of measurement, looking about him in that period which was inclined to accept Jean-Jacques' abolition of the absolute (there is no absolute unless it be this that there is absolutely none) and which was leading to the hedonism of Anatole France ("quand la route est fleurie ne demandez pas où elle mène") and to Gourmont with his brilliant science of cases (*le Chemin de Velours*) and his doctrine that there is no devil and "the soul is an invention of the Sorbonne,"—where in the midst of these tendencies does Sainte-Beuve stand? Or does he stand at all?

He seems steadily to have sought firm ground. His approach was, naturally, through literature, and he is found remarking, in words which perhaps refute by anticipation the later characterization of him, "l'esprit poétique n'est pas le Juif errant."<sup>4</sup> Taste was to him, in literature, on the level with true Christianity in religion.<sup>5</sup> When he devoted himself to investigation of a religious phenomenon in *Port-Royal*, the results, as those who argue for his instability insist, were disappointing, and the last words of the book appear good evidence of hopeless drifting: "il s'aperçoit à son tour qu'il n'est qu'une illusion des plus fugitives au sein de l'illusion infinie."<sup>6</sup> Yet in this same final volume, the very tone in which he regrets the lack of a firmer texture, intellectual and moral, shows how he craves it: "L'école qui serait issue de

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Harper, *Sainte-Beuve*, pp. 201-202. Cf. Sainte-Beuve himself as quoted by Mott, p. 242. "Let us be philosophers and even have a philosophy, but let us not insist on any particular philosophy."

<sup>3</sup> Babbitt, *Masters of Modern French Criticism*, p. 187.

<sup>4</sup> *Causeries du Lundi*, III, 53.

<sup>5</sup> *Port-Royal*, I, 417.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 246.

Port-Royal, si Port-Royal eût vécu, aurait fait *noyau* dans la nation, lui aurait peut-être donné solidité, consistance; car *c'étaient des gens*, comme me le disait M. Royer-Collard, *avec qui l'on savait sur quoi compter*; caractère qui a surtout manqué depuis à nos mobiles et brillantes générations françaises."<sup>7</sup> His reluctance at the end to accept mobility is in keeping with the spirit which impelled him in the first place to attempt in a study of the Jansenists to become "plus versé et plus fixé dans la science morale des âmes."<sup>8</sup>

May one not assign this "believer without religion" (as Professor Mott himself so excellently quotes, p. 402) to what is somehow the aesthetic or spiritual equivalent of Renan's "position intellectuelle?"<sup>9</sup> Or if we refuse to do so must we not refuse, like Professor Babbitt, plainly? Mr. Mott remarks at the beginning of his work (p. ix): "I am no apologist or advocate, and I have tried not to color my statements; let the record speak." This is faithfully and admirably reminiscent of the Sainte-Beuve position: "I relate and exhibit; enough for me if everyone shall perceive the point by which he may pierce to the heart of the question." Yet one could wish that this record, Mr. Mott's description of contents, spoke in terms more certain.

Whenever we leave Sainte-Beuve's doctrine for his method, Professor Mott becomes more positive, and in particular insists, with good judgment, that the importance of Sainte-Beuve's 1862 article on method has been exaggerated. But here too it may be regretted a little that the author has not brought out more clearly the particular quality of balance which Sainte-Beuve so beautifully achieves. The critic is determined to "*voir les grands hommes comme ils ont été*,"<sup>10</sup> and in the presence of certain asseverations of greatness he observes: "*J'écoute, et je ne suis pas ému*";<sup>11</sup> but he is also delicately aware of the need of a counterpoise, of the fact that, as Joubert whom he admires says, "*il ne faut rien voir tout nu*." This is the source of his superiority to Anatole France,

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, vi, 192.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, i, 454.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *L'Avenir de la Science*, p. 56.

<sup>10</sup> *Port-Royal*, i, 487.

<sup>11</sup> *Nouveaux Lundis*, iii, 29. Cf. indeed the apt quotation in Mott, p. 251: "When I have read something very lyrical, he says, or heard and applauded something very academic, when I have been present at one of those parliamentary triumphs in which the factious orator has laid his hand on his heart, in which the self-interested and versatile politician has been prodigal of the words loyalty and country, and when each has made his magnificent bow to the lofty lights of the epoch, I open, on coming home, my Grosley, or some book like it, my *Journal de Collé* my *Margrave de Bareilh*, and after having read a few pages, I find a foothold on the earth fit for our humble nature, saying under my breath to the honorable, eloquent, illustrious speaker: 'You lie!'"

for example, in the judging of martyrs: to Anatole France in a certain mood (and to Bernard Shaw) martyrs are stupid; Sainte-Beuve does not claim sagacity for them but neither does he refuse reverence: "On trouve . . . cette ardeur du martyre parfaitement déraisonnable, et on est saisi en même temps d'un sentiment de compassion, de respect. Savoir souffrir par un scrupule (même erroné) de conscience, n'hésiter pas à sacrifier son repos à ce qu'on croit la justice et la vérité, est chose si rare!"<sup>12</sup> There are examples of this quality of poise in Mott's description of Sainte-Beuve, and pertinent quotations, just as there is copious material from which a sufficiently studious reader may draw conclusions as to Sainte-Beuve's essence. If this is what the author means by "let the record speak," one admits readily that he has furnished ingredients for a decision. The problem is one of focus; the reviewer continues to regret that Professor Mott did not adhere less rigidly to a chronological order, so apt to exclude composition, and present a picture of which the outlines might be sharper.

On the other hand the portrait of Sainte-Beuve, the representation of him as a personality, is done with a sure brush; the author has practised with notable success what Mr. Gamaliel Bradford, as a disciple of Sainte-Beuve, denominates "the art of psycho-graphy." He makes Sainte-Beuve the man very present, and his style is engaging. He almost achieves a formula (no doubt in spite of himself, since he detests them) when he ends a chapter by saying of Sainte-Beuve (p. 235): "He was a materialist, somehow trailing clouds of glory." He has the sense and courage to aver that *Port-Royal* is sometimes dull (p. 167): "An unregenerate appetite might be satisfied with a smaller quantity of this very plain spiritual nourishment. . . . If the older Arnauld's eloquence is turgid we must learn the fact by example; if Nicole or the Great Arnauld is as tedious as a king, we are not spared the demonstration." Above all Mr. Mott treats with wisdom the allegations that Sainte-Beuve was petty and malignant; without representing the critic as chemically pure he does demonstrate convincingly that Sainte-Beuve (p. 399) "kept his taste above his passions." All told, a book which will help spread the gospel of good criticism. If one has ventured certain objections, these are in the spirit of the Sainte-Beuve tradition, of which Professor Mott explicitly approves, that it is good for a reviewer to resist his author.<sup>13</sup>

HORATIO E. SMITH.

*Brown University.*

<sup>12</sup> *Port-Royal*, VI, 185.

<sup>13</sup> A few misprints were noted: p. 15, *Loire-inférieur*, read *Loire-inférieure*; p. 45, *Lemartine*, read *Lamartine*; p. 362, *disposition*, read *dispositions*; p. 371, *Causéries*, read *Causeries*.

*Letters of James Boswell* collected and edited by CHAUNCEY B. TINKER, Oxford University Press, 1924, 2 vols. \$10.

Boswell was not a great letter-writer. Most of this correspondence is natural and straightforward but it gives few hints of the literary abilities displayed in the *Life* or of the wit, the grace of expression, the "adorable chit-chat," the fund of anecdote, or the brilliant judgment of men and books that make the "epistolary recreations" of many of his contemporaries delightful reading. Yet the best of it possesses in a high degree one of the prime requisites of good letters, that of revealing an unusually interesting personality. One reads it for Boswell, not his opinions or his anecdotes but himself. And how naked does he strip himself before us,—his vanity, naiveté, his craving for fame and for intimacy with the great, his moralizings, good resolutions speedily broken and as speedily renewed, his fits of despondency, his drunkenness and moral laxity with their consequences, his likeableness and his genuine affection for his family and friends. Was a more astonishing letter ever written than that to "Zelide" (Isabella de Zuylen, the daughter of a Dutch nobleman) in which he boasts of his own self-control, accuses her of loving him, charges her to confess it, moralizes, preaches religion to her, and ends a strange, rambling quasi-postscript by asking whether, if he had "pretended a passion," she would have gone with him "to the world's end!" Did she know him well enough to sense his delightful but unconscious absurdity when he declared:

I am a man of form, a man who says to himself, Thus will I act, and acts accordingly. In short, a man subjected to discipline, who has his *orders* for his conduct during the day with as much exactness as any soldier in any service. And who gives these orders? I give them. Boswell when cool and sedate fixes rules for Boswell to live by in this common course of life.

Yet this "man subjected to discipline" craved a confessor, one who knew him well, cared for him, and to whom he could pour himself out with a freedom and completeness that few men have ever allowed themselves. Fortunately for us he found such a friend in William Temple and, as a result, the ninety-odd letters to Temple—here first printed accurately and, save for two or three phrases, in full-form, in Mr. Tinker's words, "the heart of the collection" and "in one sense . . . as remarkable and instructive a human document as the Diary of Pepys or the *Confessions* of Rousseau." At least they have sufficient interest to hold one reader, who intended only to dip into them, until long past midnight. They should be read continuously, apart from the other correspondence, so that their full savor may be appreciated and

the melancholy difference between the young and the old man may be realized.

The better one knows Boswell the more interesting one finds him but hardly the more admirable, nor does one gain any clearer insight into how such a man, sinking under drink, debt, and despondency, was able to write the greatest English biography. Yet now and then his literary instinct shows itself unmistakably, as when, in the midst of his account of courting Miss Blair, he exclaims, "Temple, you must have it in the genuine dialogue" and gives over a page of it in dramatic form.

Some light will be thrown on the composition of the *Life* if the one letter to Johnson which has survived as it was originally written (pp. 185-7) be compared with the terser form given to it in the biography. The differences are immaterial but they are not indicated and they show that, accurate as Boswell was, he did not hesitate to condense and change what he professed to quote. It is surprising to find him stressing the value of the *Life* less than the pleasure to be derived from it. At least three times he wrote, varying the words but slightly, "It will be the most entertaining book that ever appeared." The letters remind us anew of Johnson's real affection for Boswell but they afford little evidence that the *affection* was returned. Clearly there was something winsome in the young Scot. "Am I not fortunate," he writes,—after explaining how "an agreeable young widow nursed me and supported my lame foot on her knee,"—"Am I not fortunate in having something about me that interests most people at first sight in my favour?" This something was in part gay spirits, good humor, and an appreciation for the excellences of others, in part it came from his practicing what he had preached to Zelide, "above all endeavour to relish the common affairs of life," but to no slight degree it was the result of his confiding, childlike helplessness. "I am somewhat melancholy," he wrote to Temple, "Pray comfort me. This is very effeminate and very young; but I cannot help it." The appeal was irresistible.

Mr. Tinker has collected the letters from a wide variety of places, has annotated them admirably but has not discussed them or their author nor has he told us anything of their history, which in the case of those to Temple is of considerable interest. Nearly a hundred he prints for the first time. His knowledge of the field and of the entire eighteenth century is too well known to require comment. Scholars may wish that the two dignified, beautifully-printed volumes had been combined into one—there are only 550 pages—and sold at a lower figure but they will find comfort in the excellent notes and index.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

*Johns Hopkins University.*



# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume XLI

February, 1926

Number 2

---

---

## OTWAY'S DUELS WITH CHURCHILL AND SETTLE

BY ROSWELL G. HAM

The tragedy of "poor Otway" has been bewailed by several generations of sentimental biographers, yet the brief cycle of his career, up to the tragic dénouement on Tower Hill, seems at least to have been free from the curse of tedium. The adventurous vein ran high in the romantic young playwright when, in 1678, he enlisted for service in Flanders. It was only the untoward peace of Nimeguen that brought him back to London, early in 1679, uncelebrated and penniless. So ignominious a period to his hopes led biographer Cibber, who should have taken pains to consult his histories, to impute against Otway the charge of cowardice.<sup>1</sup> Fortunately for the poet's good name, "poor Otway" writes enough of his own feelings and experiences into his autobiographical *Soldier's Fortune*<sup>2</sup> that Cibber might well have spared his homily. Back from the war, thus without money or honor, Otway undertook to repair the lack of both: the former, by writing an indifferent but successful play upon *Caius Marius*, and the latter, by two "handsome" adventures, of which one has escaped all notice of his biographers while the other has been generally misinterpreted. And what makes them unusually notable is the great prominence of nearly all the parties involved.

The first and most romantic triumph occurred, fittingly enough, at the Duke's Playhouse sometime in June of 1679. He had returned to his old haunts, where, according to an established obligation, these indigent playwrights were given free admission. Along with them, at this particular period, were swarms of disbanded soldiers who helped to swell the lagging audiences. In this setting

<sup>1</sup> *The Lives of the Poets*, London, 1753, II, 326.

<sup>2</sup> Act I, sc. 1.

our somewhat humiliated poet found occasion to issue from eclipse, in the rôle of man of honor and defender of orange wenches. Account of the great event is to be found in a letter preserved in the Verney mss.<sup>3</sup> Under date of June 23, 1679, Sir John Verney makes the following observations:

Churchill, for beating an orange wench' in the Duke's Play-house, was challenged by Capt. Otway (the poet), and were both wounded, but Churchill most. The relation being told the King, by Sir John Holmes, as Churchill thought to his prejudice, he challenged Holmes, who fighting disarmed him Churchill.

That our poet was the first author of these various reverses to Churchill cannot be questioned. True, Otway was but a lieutenant. Titles in that age however seemed to mean as little as they do today. It was only a few months later in an epilogue to *Caius Marius* that Mrs. Barry conferred upon him the same rank that he bears in Verney's statement. Referring to Otway in conjunction with her late rôle in Shadwell's *Woman Captain*, Mrs. Barry had said:

For t'other day I was a Captain too—

words significantly put in her mouth by Otway himself.

But while there can be no doubt but that Otway was one of the parties, the identity of Churchill is more of an open question. We may note that Sir John Verney speaks of "Churchill" as a figure well known to the world. Only John or Charles would answer, both brothers of the well known Arabella; and John had the greater celebrity, not so much by the exploits of his sister, as by his own hasty exit through the window of the Duchess of Cleveland's boudoir at the unexpected entrance of the King,<sup>4</sup> and by his dashing adventures abroad in the service of Louis. The question arises whether he would be available in London in June of 1679. The biographies of Marlborough, so far as they refer at all to this particular year, imply that he was continuously in the low countries with the exiled Duke of York. We have evidence to the contrary, however, in the *Calendar of State Papers* for 1679.<sup>5</sup> In their lists of passports these indicate that Churchill

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Mss. Comm.*, 7th Report, 473a.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Mrs. Manley's *Secret Memoirs*, 1720, I, 31 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Index under 'Churchill.'

crossed back and forth several times in that year. Still another neglected bit of his biography sheds considerable light upon the entire episode. Probably in order to give voice to the claims of the exiled James, the future Duke was returned for Newtown (Isle of Wight) as a member of the House of Commons in the short session summoned by Charles for March 6, 1678/9 and dissolved on the July twelfth of the same year. Elected with him from Newtown was Sir John Holmes,<sup>6</sup> the same who completed Churchill's discomfiture at court by his account of the duel.

The story now becomes fairly obvious. As an interlude to his parliamentary and diplomatic duties, Colonel Churchill had descended upon the playhouse in the company of his colleague, where he became embroiled in some sort of altercation with Orange Betty. Such sporadic eruptions of the pit generally required very little to set off the fuse, with results sometimes far more disastrous than in this case. One conjectures whether it was the price of oranges which enraged the thrifty Colonel. From other information this seems plausible. It is a fairly safe guess that Aphra Behn was touching upon Otway's exploit in her hitherto unexplained prologue to *The Young King*, 1679, produced not long thereafter at the same playhouse. As one of the friends of Otway, Mrs. Behn was bound to take more than passing interest in his memorable victory, where ordinarily such a disturbance would either remain unnoticed or be censured. Her gibes have an unwonted tone of amusement, particularly at the thriftiness of one of the protagonists, when she alludes to his mock heroic over oranges, the purport of which was doubtless recognized by most of her audience:

They're Sparks who are of Noise and Nonsense full,  
At fifteen witty, and at twenty dull;  
That in the Pit can huff, and talk hard words,  
And briskly draw Bamboo instead of Swords:  
But never yet Rencounter cou'd compare  
To our late vigorous *Tartarian War*;<sup>7</sup>  
Cudgel the Weapon was, the Pit the Field;  
Fierce was the Hero, and too brave to yield.  
But stoutest Hearts must bow; and being well can'd,  
He cries, Hold, hold, you have the Victory gain'd.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Accounts and Papers*, LXII, 1, 537.

<sup>7</sup> Tartarus, a common name for the pit.

All laughing call—  
 Turn out the Rascal, the eternal Blockhead;  
 —*Zounds*, cries *Tartarian*, I am out of Pocket:  
 Half Crown my Play, Sixpence my Orange cost;  
 Equip me that, do you the Conquest boast  
 For which to be at ease, a Gathering's made,  
 And out they turn the Brother of the Blade.

The ungallant conduct of the Colonel apparently awakened our poet from his moody reveries, and a storm ensued that the hero of Blenheim was unable to ride. Otway was thus responsible for the first and last military reverse of a great soldier's career.

This adventure probably went far toward rehabilitating the poet in his own good esteem. But if it was not sufficient, Otway at that time was very likely famous for another exploit, faint echoes of which have come down to the present from a casual reference in Malone's *Life of Dryden*. And inasmuch as the latter encounter resembles not so much a single skirmish as a long drawn out engagement involving several other well known figures and the authorship of an important poem, it seems best to treat it as subsequent to his duel with Churchill, particularly since its final flare-up came late in 1683.

The year before that, Shadwell the Whig poet had published the following objectionable verses, which, in their present form as given by Malone,<sup>8</sup> have been our only source of information upon the affair, and that of the haziest:

The laurel makes a wit; a brave, the sword;  
 And all are wise men at a council-board:  
 Settle's a coward, 'cause fool Otway fought him,  
 And Mulgrave is a wit, because I taught him.

This second imbroglio has generally been attributed to dissension on Parnassus over the patronage of the capricious Earl of Rochester, who transferred his benevolence from Crowne to Settle to Otway as his fancy dictated. On the contrary it is quite certain that the duel with Settle had its origin in events that were far removed from the whims of Rochester. Around 1677 a scurrilous libel appeared, called *The Session of the Poets*, that quite universally has been attributed to Rochester, and for no very good

<sup>8</sup>I (pt. 1), 165.

reason except that everything indecent or particularly libellous, by common consent has been deposited at his door. Otway was one of the most aggrieved of the poets abused in that work, and that the barb hit home is shown by his reference to it in his *Poet's Complaint* of 1680. The lines which stung were these:

Tom Otway came next, Tom Shadwell's dear Zany,  
And swears for Heroicks, he writes best of any: <sup>9</sup>  
Don Carlos his Pockets so amply had fill'd,  
That his Mange was quite cur'd, and his Lice were all kill'd;  
But Apollo had seen his Face on the Stage,  
And prudently did not think fit to engage,  
The Scum of a Play-house, for the Prop of an Age.

Now this attack upon Otway has been quoted infinitely to demonstrate the heartlessness of Rochester in turning thus upon our poet, when the nobleman had barely received dedication of one of the latter's plays. Bliss, with scholarly enthusiasm, appended a note to the effect that Otway's "personal misfortunes" were acquired during the service in Flanders.<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately however we may know by reference to the various plays that the libel was written a full year before Otway left for service abroad. Indeed, this *Session of the Poets*, upon which has been built nearly the whole magnificent structure of Rochester's relations with the poets and playwrights of his age, was believed by Otway as late as 1680 not to have been written by Rochester at all, but by Elkanah Settle.

We come now to the occasion of the great duel,—which may or may not have been fought. It unquestionably began in the days when Settle and Otway found themselves aligned upon opposite sides of the political fence. However much we may ridicule the plays of Elkanah, the pamphlets of that worthy were something to be reckoned with. He had bespattered the Tories with singular skill from beneath the whiggish banner of Shaftesbury, until around 1682. At that time it apparently became evident to him that the occupation of Whig was no longer to be lucrative. He recanted therefore and became a Tory, but did not display the full fervor of his recantation until his *Narrative* of 1683. Nevertheless, as early as 1682 this change was obvious enough that it drew

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Otway's boast in 'The Preface' to *Don Carlos*.

<sup>10</sup> *Ath. Oxon.*, iv, 169.

from the enraged Whigs a furious blast in a pamphlet called *A Character of the True Blue Protestant Poet*. After indelicate allusion to certain sins in the past of Elkanah, the pamphleteer touched upon the authorship of *A Session of the Poets*.

It happened about four years ago, there came out a Copy of Verses of the same *Libellous nature of Azaria, and Hushai* (which by the greatest part of the Town has been accounted his;) but since the *Illegitimate Brat* had not the strength to Support it self, and he found its deformity, and weakness, gave no credit to the *Vigorous Abilities* of the Father; He (tis said) has laid it at an Impotent, Lame Mans door, who because he never had any of his own, he gladly *Adopted the Bastard*;) But our *Malicious Buzzard* did not in those days Soar so high, he only did abuse the *Poets* then, into whose number he would fain have crept, which because they always scorn'd, and lookt with Contempt upon him, He endeavours thus to revenge himself; but it fell out most unluckily, for a discovery was soon made of our *Author*.

And Mr. O. a Man of the Sword, as well as the Pen, finding himself most coursly dealt withal, immediately call'd him to an account, and required the satisfaction of a Gentleman from him: This I must confess was something unreasonable, and did by no means agree with our *Scribblers Constitution*, who had much rather *Rail* than *Fight*; and being at this news as much surprized, and in little better pickle, than Alderman Atkins would have been upon the like occasion, beg'd he would spare his Life, and he would give him any other satisfaction he could desire; and presently taking *Pen, Ink, and Paper* out of his Pocket, he writ these following words, (viz.) *I confess I Writ the Session of the Poets, and am very sorry for't, and am the Son of A Whore* for doing it; *Witness my hand E. S.* This he delivered to Mr. C. which it seems saved his Throat that time; but I am afraid for a worse hand.

The composer of this squib was probably not so very far from correct in his account of the manner in which *The Session of the Poets* came first to be laid at Rochester's door. For there is extant a letter from Henry Savile to Rochester which shows it in the very process of seeking its foster-father. By the date of this letter, Nov. 1, 1677, we can definitely fix the appearance of the satire, though we should judge by internal evidence that it was written some six months earlier. Savile states:

Now I am upon Poetry, I must tell you the whole tribe are alarumed att a libell against them lately sent by post to Will's coffe house. I am not happy enough to have seen it but I heare it commended and therefore the more probably thought to be composed at Woodstock, especially con-

sidering what an assembly either is yett or att least has been there, to whom my most humble service, if they are yett with you.<sup>11</sup>

Others—amongst them, Otway—were not so easily convinced that Rochester was its father. Late in 1679 the aggrieved playwright took up the quarrel again, in his *Poet's Complaint*, and scattered grapeshot to the four winds. It was this poem that Dr. Johnson<sup>12</sup> confessed he could not understand, and the editors of the poem since, by their efforts to shed light, have only perplexed matters further. It is now clear, at any rate, that the following from the pen of Otway was an assault upon the politically disembodied shade of Elkanah, and not as it has always been assumed upon Rochester, to whom it can on no account be considered applicable. In fact Otway had just rounded off that nobleman with some skill, when he began thus with Settle:

Next him appear'd that blundering Sot  
Who a late *Session of the Poets* wrote.  
Nature has maikt him for a heavy Fool;  
By's flat broad Face you'l know the Owl,  
The other Birds have hooted him from light;  
Much buffeting has made him love the Night,  
And onely in the dark he strays;  
Still Wretch enough to live, with worse Fools spends his days  
And for old Shoes and Scraps repeats dull Plays.<sup>13</sup>

It will be objected that Settle is treated elsewhere in *The Poet's Complaint*:

The City-Poet too was there,  
In a black Sattin Cap and his own Hair.

But Elkanah was not appointed city-poet until 1691, long years after the smoke of this engagement had blown away. And as for Rochester, aside from the verses pointing at him earlier in the poem, we have added proof that these were not intended as a cut at him by the very nature of the lines themselves. Whatever else he was, Rochester was not a heavy fool, his features were the opposite of flat and broad, and he was never given to repeating dull plays, particularly for "old shoes and scraps." That was to be Elkanah's function throughout life.

<sup>11</sup> *Hist. Mss. Comm. Bath*, II, 158.

<sup>12</sup> *Lives of the Poets*, 'Otway.'

<sup>13</sup> Stanza VIII.

And that the miserable Elkanah should be more the object of our sympathy than "poor Otway" is clear enough from the agony with which he carried about the barbs of this attack until as late as 1683. In that year the "Owl" from his brooding place in the purlieus of London brought forth a retort,<sup>14</sup> that was however most meticulous not to stir up the sleeping Otway.

"I was accused," he said, "of being the author of a Scandalous Copy of Verses call'd the *Session of the Poets*, an ill natured scurrilous Lam-poon, written some years since, and now laid as believed at the Father's Door, being printed among Lord R's—Poems. Amongst the other Extravagancies in that Base and Malicious Libel against me It was said that I gave it under my Hand to Mr. O——, a gentleman highly wronged and affronted in that paper of Verses, that *I was the Author of that Session of Poets, and for which I was the Son of a Whore*—which is so damnable a falsehood . . . &c, &c."

The future city-poet at this juncture breaks into a frenzy of denial that does not very much concern us.

The reverberations of all great things die away. Poor Otway for all his heroic deeds has been maliciously written down a coward. Perhaps Elkanah *was* unjustly maligned by Tom Shadwell, when the latter pictured him in a duel with Otway, or perhaps the reputation of Otway as duelist was not at its zenith as yet, so that he little knew what a hornet he was stirring up. One strongly suspects however that Elkanah in his most furious moments never dreamed of facing our fire-eater upon the field of honor.

*Yale University.*

---

## WILLIAM SOMERVILE'S EARLIEST POEM

BY RAYMOND D. HAVENS

In 1802 Francis Godolphin Waldron, whose varied talents had made him an actor in Garrick's company, the manager of several theatres, the author of not a few plays, and the editor of a number of antiquarian works, printed, "chiefly from Manuscripts in the possession of, and with occasional Notes by" himself, *The Shakespearean Miscellany: containing a collection of . . . Tracts . . .*

<sup>14</sup> *A Supplement to the Narrative.* Written by E. Settle, London, 1683.



*Anecdotes of Theatrical Performers . . . Scarce and Original Poetry; and Curious Remains of Antiquity.* This *Miscellany* falls into four parts, each of which with its own pagination was sold separately. The third section, "Miscellaneous Poetry,"<sup>1</sup> is largely given over to the *Wicker Chair*, a burlesque of *Paradise Lost* by William Somervile, author of *The Chace*. According to a note prefixed to this piece, "The Preface, Arguments, and Poem, now given to the Public, from Mr. Somervile's own manuscript, have never before (it is believed) been published in the present form." Yet publication can hardly be said to have rescued the work from oblivion, since, except in the British Museum Catalogue and in a bibliography of the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, it seems to have remained unnoticed. Waldron's ambiguous words, "in the present form,"<sup>2</sup> point to one explanation of this neglect, namely, that a large part of the poem is identical with *Hobbinol, or the Rural Games*, which Somervile published in 1740.

Yet if the *Wicker Chair* is not entirely new, it is of interest because, aside from showing Somervile's methods of revision, it contains some four hundred otherwise unknown lines of his verse and a preface that throws light on his life and writings, but chiefly because it seems to have been written before any of his other extant works. The earliest date that can be assigned to any of the other poems is 1712, or, perhaps, the end of 1711.<sup>3</sup> Now, the suggestion of writing the *Wicker Chair* came to him, so he tells us in the preface, one winter evening when he was reading John Phillips's *Cyder*, "which was then just publish'd." As *Cyder* appeared January 29, 1708,<sup>4</sup> and as Somervile seems to have set

<sup>1</sup> The collection begins with Donne's elegy, "Love's War," printed for the first time.

<sup>2</sup> In his foot-notes, furthermore, he mentions "the printed copies."

<sup>3</sup> Aside from the *Wicker Chair*, Somervile's earliest work is in his *Occasional Poems* (1727). Of these the first is on Marlborough's "removal from all his places," and therefore cannot be earlier than December 31, 1711; the second is dated 1712; the third, to Addison on his "purchasing an estate in Warwickshire," may have been written late in 1711 when the purchase was made; the fourth refers to Addison's papers on *Paradise Lost*, which began to appear in 1712. The rest are later.

<sup>4</sup> Gilbert McCoy Troxell, Esq., of the Yale University library, who has been good enough to look up the matter for me, writes that *Cyder* was

to work on his burlesque immediately, he must have written it in the winter of 1708-9 or of 1709-10. This date not only makes the piece its author's earliest effort but puts it twenty-five years earlier than his other unrimed poems and brings it into the period, before *The Seasons* was written, when long works in blank verse were very rare. Our appreciation of Philips's importance is also increased when we realize that Somervile's first poem is a long piece composed in conscious imitation of *Cyder*.

It all came about naturally enough. The poet, already thirty-two, was spending the hunting season in Gloucestershire at the home of one of his tenants, a farmer who was "remarkably fond of an old wicker chair, the legacy of his forefathers." In this chair "he smoak'd his pipe, regal'd himself with his toast and ale, and then very regularly fell asleep. This was his constant custom morning, and afternoon, and in this favourite wicker he often spent the greatest part of the night." One evening, as Somervile was "entertaining himself with the noble harmony, and various cadence of the verse" of *Cyder*, the farmer waked up and asked what he was reading. "Apples?", he exclaimed on being told something of the poem, ". . . is it not pity so lofty a style should be thrown away upon a pippin? Were you to describe even me here in my wicker you could not express yourself with greater sublimity. The gentleman took the hint, and accordingly has form'd this Poem upon the very plan he himself proposed."<sup>5</sup>

Somervile did not look upon his work over-seriously, as the concluding words of his preface show: "The author . . . writ this out-of-the-way Poem for the entertainment of some particular friends; and if it can in any measure divert their spleens, has obtained his end. He does not indeed expect they should hang this droll-piece in their drawing rooms. He leaves the rooms of state to the possession of a Lilly or Vandyke, and will be perfectly satisfied if it may have the honour of aspiring to a place in the

advertised in the *Daily Courant* for January 29, 1708, and in the *London Gazette* for January 26-29, 1707. In the *Gazette* the announcement begins, "This day is published." Since the *Courant* commenced the new year on January 1 and the *Gazette* on March 25, 1708 is, according to present usage, the correct date.

<sup>5</sup> Preface to the *Wicker Chair*, in the *Shakspearean Miscellany*, third pagination, pp. 26-7.

drinking room. Nay, so much is he their humble servant, that he will be content (if they are of opinion it does not deserve a better post) to be allowed a corner in a less honourable, but more necessary apartment." Thirty years later, however, when he came to revise and publish the poem, he professed a more serious purpose. "It is a Satire," the later preface declares, "against the Luxury, the Pride, the Wantonness, and quarrelsome Temper of the middling Sort of People."

The reader who is skeptical of this assertion may also question the reason Somervile assigns for publishing the piece:

The Author . . . is satisfied, that there are many imperfect Copies of this Trifle dispers'd abroad, and as he is credibly inform'd, that he shall soon be expos'd to View in such an Attitude, as he would not care to appear in; He thinks it most prudent in this desperate Case to throw himself on the Mercy of the Public; and offer this whimsical Work a voluntary Sacrifice, in Hope that he stands a better Chance for their Indulgence, *now it has receiv'd his last Hand*, than when curtail'd and mangled by others.<sup>6</sup>

Although this reads suspiciously like the familiar and dubious prefaces of modest authors who are forced to publish their work in self-defence, it is in the main almost certainly true. For the *Wicker Chair* had been in manuscript for many years, and the "particular friends" for whose "entertainment" it was written had, in all probability, copied and circulated it. One of these copies, more or less imperfect, may well have fallen into the hands of an unscrupulous publisher who, trusting to the popularity of *The Chace*, might perhaps have brought it out had not Somervile forestalled him.<sup>7</sup> It was from the poet's own manuscript that Waldron claimed to print the work, and, though he may have been mistaken in this, the *Wicker Chair* gives no evidence of being "curtail'd and mangled by others."<sup>8</sup>

The changes which the poem received from the author's "last Hand" are principally at the beginning and the end and can be easily explained. For one thing, the *Wicker Chair* contains two short passages which, like the conclusion of the original preface

<sup>6</sup> Preface to *Hobbinol*. The italics are mine.

<sup>7</sup> The haste with which the revision seems to have been made (see p. 84 below) also points to the fear of unauthorized publication.

<sup>8</sup> It is, indeed, several pages longer than *Hobbinol*.

quoted above, a young sportsman might write but might not, particularly in his later years, care to publish. But the chief criticism to be made of this first version is that in the beginning it sticks too close to the circumstances that gave it birth. In consequence, it devotes the first ten pages to descriptions of the characters and the setting, is loosely constructed, and, in one important matter, is not clear. It begins, after announcing the theme and invoking Philips, by describing Hobbinol, his housekeeper—whom but for “law perverse” he would have married,<sup>9</sup>—his wicker chair, and the shelf of books over it (of which a good deal is said). The rest of the poem is taken up with Hobbinol’s dream of his youthful exploits, one of which is so vivid that he leaps up and overturns upon himself the shelf of books.

On revising the poem Somerville greatly condensed the account of the characters and the setting, omitted the housekeeper as well as the books, and, apparently realizing his failure to make clear that all the events narrated in the *Wicker Chair* take place in a dream, gave Hobbinol a young son and a niece who actually do the things of which, in the earlier version, the old man had dreamed. So much is undoubtedly an improvement; but Somerville did his work carelessly—perhaps when he was old and was hurrying to get the book into print—or he would have seen that Hobbinol, with whom the poem begins, disappears after the eighth page and might better have been omitted entirely. Still more careless was it to leave unchanged the latter part of the burlesque which was written for and was admirably adapted to Hobbinol—a pompous, ridiculous swain of easy morals—but was totally inconsistent with the character of the ideal young lover who had been made the hero of the revised piece.<sup>10</sup> The end, too, in which the hero is arrested for seduction, is abrupt, is not in the burlesque spirit, and is obviously patchwork.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> An excellent illustration of how closely Somerville adhered to the facts. The detail adds nothing to the poem and is understood only by those who remember, from the preface, that the farmer “would have married her (though his niece) if the gentleman had not . . . prevented it.”

<sup>10</sup> The crowning absurdity comes when the adolescent lover, who is so much enamoured of his cousin as to be her “faithful shade” that “ne’er wander’d from her Side,” is made the seducer of Mopsa and apparently the father of her two children.

<sup>11</sup> The original conclusion, in which Hobbinol starts up in his dream

There seems to be no reason for questioning the genuineness of the *Wicker Chair*. Waldron, a reliable and fairly well-known antiquary, says that he worked from Somervile's own manuscript; the piece is throughout in Somervile's style, and is in large part identical with one of his acknowledged poems, other versions of which were, as he tells us, circulating in manuscript. Furthermore, it is highly improbable that any one should have fabricated a variation of a minor work of a minor poet who in 1802 was little read; and, finally, the differences between the two poems all indicate that the *Wicker Chair* is an earlier version of *Hobbinol*.

As Waldron's *Miscellany* is scarce and the *Wicker Chair* is not likely to be reprinted, it may be well to quote from some of the passages that were later omitted. The one which describes the shelf of books is of interest not only for the books themselves but for Somervile's comment, "The reader . . . will agree with me that there is not one in the whole catalogue but is a very strong opiate:"<sup>12</sup>

Here the poor dreaming Pilgrim Bunyan old  
On the more vig'rous Baxter leans reclin'd:  
From whose large base a rope of onions hangs. . . .  
Deep in the dark recess, Naylor, and Fox,  
In gloomy sadness glouting, seem to hold  
Spiritual intercourse, for these elect,  
Pure essences, from earthly clog enlarg'd,  
Commune not by the ministry of words,  
Or sound articulate, but soul with soul  
Immix'd, in streaming beam of light convey  
Their thoughts profound. Intuitive converse! . . .  
Hugh Peters, Burgess, Doelittle and Case,  
Love's Garland, Pills to Purge Melancholy,  
Assembly's Cat'chism, Poor Robin's Almanack,  
A Direct'ry, Culpeper's Midwifry,  
Caryl on Job. The reader's patience tried  
In five large folios. Markham's Housewifry.  
A chain of gold for a believer's neck  
In thirty links. Tom Coriat's Crudities.  
Apples of gold; Fair Warning; Spiritual Pea.

---

and overturns the books, had to be changed, since there is no dream in the second version.

<sup>12</sup> Preface to the *Wicker Chair*, in *Shakspearean Miscellany*, third pagination, p. 27.

Tom Thumb's bold deeds. A Spelling-Book with Notes.  
 Fast Sermon preach'd before his Highness Noll  
 The Lord Protector. English Rogue compleat.<sup>13</sup>

The burlesque element in the poem will be fairly represented by the following lines:

Nor did the furious tabby when alive  
 Scream more melodious, thro' the lonely dark  
 Pensive she creeps, and in each path obscure  
 Hunts for her wand'ring mate, the skulking prey  
 Skip unregarded by; no other cares  
 Perplex her breast, no other joys but love.  
 Then on the summit of a well-stor'd barn,  
 Stung with intolerable rage, she snuffs  
 The midnight breeze, the welkin all around  
 Utters her shrill complaints. O wretched slave  
 Of never-ceasing love! for ev'n when dead  
 And all her lives are to a period worn,  
 Her restless passion lives; the vocal strings  
 From her warm entrails torn, ev'n then retain  
 Incitements strange to amorous delight.<sup>14</sup>

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

## FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL'S APOSTASY AND THE *EUROPA*<sup>1</sup>

BY T. M. CAMPBELL

In 1803 Friedrich Schlegel, then living in Paris, published the *Europa* in four numbers. The most important contributions to this periodical were written by the editor himself, who made desperate but in the main futile efforts to enlist the support of his friends in Germany for his undertaking. He collected his material for the publication in 1802 and 1803. In November of the

<sup>13</sup> *Shakspearean Miscellany*, third pagination, pp. 39-41.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* 45-6.

<sup>1</sup> This article is a completely revised version of a paper read at the M. L. A. under the same title, December, 1924. Fr. Schlegel's works are referred to as *S. W.* and the *Zweite Originalausgabe* of 1846 is meant.

latter year he was getting ready for the final issue.<sup>2</sup> Most of his articles have to do with painting, though one of the very first is a review of contemporary literature in Germany. Minor planned to include them in a projected third volume of the *Jugendschriften*, while conceding that in the year 1802 Schlegel's "Schriftstellerei Ton und Richtung ändert."<sup>3</sup> It is well that this plan was not carried out, for however welcome an accessible reprint of the *Europa* articles might be, by no test, whether of manner or matter, could they stand in the same collection as the essays of the period before the final departure from Jena. There is a vast difference between the conciliatory timidity in the preface of the *Europa* and the bellicose arrogance in that of the *Athenäum*; and no less difference in the style and spirit of the two periodicals. The last of Friedrich Schlegel's productions immediately preceding the *Europa*, including the Boccaccio essay of 1801, betray nothing of the impending revolution in their author's convictions. The *Europa* articles are the first authentic document of this revolution, and that is the point of view from which I wish briefly to consider them here.

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Friedrich Schlegel's conversion. It was a real change of heart. However distasteful his acceptance of the Catholic faith may have been to many of his friends and however reactionary and futile it may have appeared to his critics, it was not altogether without beneficial results. For one thing it gave this vacillating and paradoxical mind a final resting point, a stable equilibrium; and it put a none too early end to all the talk about "göttliche Frivolität, erhabene Frechheit," and other "erhabener Unsinn." What actual experiences, if any, may have caused this seemingly abrupt change in Friedrich Schlegel cannot be specified. There is no evidence on that point. Possibly the shock he received when Novalis died in his arms in the spring of 1801 may have started something deep within him. The profoundly religious spirit of his friend remained with him as a permanent example of the return to religion in a sceptical and atheistic age.<sup>4</sup> It may not be a mere coincidence

<sup>2</sup> Oskar Walzel: *Fr. Schlegels Briefe*; Sept. 16, 1802, Jan. 15, 1803, Aug. 14, 1803, Nov. 26, 1803.

<sup>3</sup> Minor: *Friedrich Schlegels Jugendschriften 1*, p. viii.

<sup>4</sup> *S. W.* II, 225.

that he selected for the name of his new periodical the subtitle of Novalis's notorious fantasy, *Die Christenheit, oder Europa*, for European unity was the underlying conception in that also. Among the premonitory signs are generally regarded the witty and paradoxical sentences on religion and the sophisticated coquetting with mysticism in the latter part of the *Athenäum*. It is possible that even this ironical and purely intellectual occupation with the words and ideas may have been an unconscious groping for the reality later seized upon, but the principle of universal irony, that room of mirrors reflecting every grimace, was not yet surrendered. Other things more to the point might be mentioned: his inner restlessness and discontent, reflected in Dorothea's letters to Schleiermacher; his inability to write; his growing dissatisfaction with criticism as a purely negative activity; his feeling of general isolation and helplessness. His aversion to polemical writing was supported by Dorothea, who also manifested a serious interest in religion. (Letter to Schleiermacher, Paris, November 1802.)

However conjectural all this may be, we are not left in doubt as to precisely what change Friedrich Schlegel underwent. Conversion in his case was an exchange of Fichtean idealism for Christian idealism, based on revelation as handed down by Catholic tradition. "Die Zersplitterung der Schule der Idealisten war gut, um das Nichtige einer Religion aus Menschenkräften einzusehen."<sup>5</sup> This conversion, like others, was a voluntary acceptance of revelation, a renunciation of the pride of reason, and a submission to divine guidance. An exchange of *Vernunft* (*Ichheit ohne Liebe*) for *Glauben* (*Das sich selbst beschränkende Denken*).<sup>6</sup> His final conviction was that Fichte's philosophy, if kept pure, would result in *leere Ichheit*, or atheism, and otherwise would lead to pantheism. In the third number of the *Europa*, which went to the printer on July 30, 1803, there is a passage indicating that this typical change from human philosophy to revelation had already been made.<sup>7</sup> But besides this specific evidence the periodical contains a great deal of indirect evidence of the same thing,

<sup>5</sup> Windischmann, *Friedrich Schlegels Philosophische Vorlesungen aus den Jahren 1804 bis 1806*. Bonn, 1836, 1837, II, 442. Also *S. W.* I, 156, 162; II, 121, 153, 212, 224, and other passages.

<sup>6</sup> Windischmann, *op. cit.* II, 433, 442.

<sup>7</sup> *Europa*, II, 1, 107-110.



and even points to the probability that Fr. Schlegel definitely accepted the new faith between the first and the third number.

Before presenting the passages concerned a more general point of view may be taken from which to judge their true significance. Fr. Schlegel once characterized his life in the following words: "In meinem Leben ist ein beständiges Suchen nach der ewigen Einheit . . . und ein Anschliessen an ein äusseres, historisch Reales oder ideal Gegebenes (zuerst Idee der Schule und einer neuen Religion der Ideen)—dann Anschliessen an den Orient, an das Deutsche, an die Freiheit der Poesie, endlich an die Kirche, da sonst überall das Suchen nach Freiheit und Einheit vergeblich war."<sup>8</sup> However much one must be on guard against a man's estimate of himself, especially when that man is Fr. Schlegel, the statement made in these words is essentially correct. His efforts were from the beginning directed toward finding some center or *Mittelpunkt* about which everything could be grouped. He had no antiquarian interest in Greek literature. All his studies in that field were inspired by the hope, fantastic as it may seem, of discovering there an objective norm for modern writers. When he relinquished this hope, he attempted to found a school based on the common effort of himself and his friends, the object being to perfect a style, just as he considered the literary productions of Greece to be stamped with one common seal of its national genius. It is a pity that he set out on this undertaking in a spirit of arrogance that would have defeated a more constructive mind. That he had good ideas on the subject is indisputable, such as for example his emphasis on popularity and *Geselligkeit* in style, qualities for which German literature is even yet not distinguished.

On the whole the best illustration of his search for unity in poetry is the *Rede über die Mythologie* (*Athenäum*, Vol. 3, 1800). Modern poets, it is there explained, suffer most for want of a mythology, a common symbolical conception of nature, which, as was the case in Greece, could become the matrix of all their works. As it is, each one has to begin anew, and this is wasteful in itself, besides producing a chaotic literature and rendering a true culture impossible. (Hauptmann expresses a similar view in his *Griechischer Frühling*.) The much needed mythology cannot be created,

<sup>8</sup> Windischmann, *op. cit.* II, 524.

as among the Greeks, by a naive view of the external world, but must arise from within the mind (Fichtean influence). The question is, however, what embodiment shall this activity of the mind discover, for poetry requires an externalization. Two things are involved in the discussion: First, the creative principle in the mind, second, the necessary symbols. In his actual designation of the first of these things, Fr. Schlegel is vague enough. He makes two suggestions: Spinoza's pantheism, and the spirit of contemporary physics (galvanism, mesmerism, etc.). He does not recommend Spinoza's philosophy as such, but only a certain mystical universality and love characteristic of it. "Und was ist jede schöne Mythologie anders als ein hieroglyphischer Ausdruck der umgebenden Natur in dieser Verklärung von Fantasie und Liebe?" As to the external symbols he is clearer—these are nothing less than all the older mythologies, ancient and oriental, which are to be renewed by the poet, "voll vom Spinoza und von jenen Ansichten, welche die jetzige Physik in jedem Nachdenkenden erregen muss."<sup>9</sup> The idea of the Christian symbols, while proposed, is regarded with less favor in this discussion.

In revising this essay to conform to his Catholic views much later, Friedrich Schlegel does not make any radical changes until he strikes the paragraph on Spinoza. This was of course the crucial passage, as it set forth, however vaguely, the main point of view from which the new mythology, or symbolical interpretation of nature was to be undertaken. The brief paragraph on Spinoza is replaced by a longer discussion of the futility of pantheism on the one hand and Fichte's *Idealismus* on the other. To both he opposes the truth, as contained in the "lebendige Entwicklung und Einwirkung der Weltgeschichte und der Offenbarung. In diesem zwiefachen Lichte der Offenbarung und der Weltgeschichte sehe ich dann eine reinere Erkenntnis des Göttlichen, eine neue oder neu verjüngte Wissenschaft des Geistes und der Seele in Gott emporblühen und sich immer reicher entfalten."<sup>10</sup> Here all vagueness as to the creative principle of a new mythology has vanished. And this identical shift in the conception of that principle is clearly, if cautiously, introduced in the *Europa* in 1803.

<sup>9</sup> Minor, *Jugendschriften*, II, 362.

<sup>10</sup> S. W. v, 201.

We may now briefly trace the indications of this shift. In the first article, *Reise nach Frankreich*, we find little that bears on the proposition. The contemporary age is indeed characterized as the real *middle age* between a better past and a brighter future. Also Europe as a whole is compared unfavorably with Asia. The general character of Europe is said to be specialization, sacrificing religion and philosophy to a greater practical efficiency. This process began in Greece. Europe has an obscure feeling that its course is wrong. There are two symptoms of such a feeling: Modern Philosophy is a continuation of Greek philosophy, and Catholicism has rescued certain elements of ancient mythology (so weit das bei der gänzlichen Verschiedenheit und Einseitigkeit der Principien möglich war). "Die Trennung hat nun ihr Äusserstes erreicht; der Charakter Europas ist ganz zum Vorschein gekommen und vollendet, und eben das ist, was das Wesen unseres Zeitalters ausmacht. Daher die gänzliche Unfähigkeit zur Religion, wenn ich mich dieses Worts bedienen darf, die absolute Erstorbenheit aller höheren Organe. Tiefer kann der Mensch nun nicht sinken."

The word religion is significant here chiefly for the apologetic way in which it is introduced. The same is true of the term *Mysticismus*, stressed in the second article, a general review of the state of German literature. "Man scheue dieses Wort Mysticismus nicht," he says, "es bezeichnet die Verkündigung der Mysterien der Kunst und der Wissenschaft." When we remember how often the author had used both of these words in Jena, his apologies become significant. As for the rest we may mention only that sentence in which Klopstock's failure to reinstate a "mythische Poesie" is attributed to his exaggerated Protestantism. But after all the deciding factor is that *Idealismus* is still regarded as the "Erhaltungsmittel und Grundlage unserer neuen Literatur." This opening number of the *Europa* also contains the first of the articles on painting, but it is little more than a prelude to our theme, in which the author marks off his particular field.

This first number of the *Europa* therefore contains little evidence of a definite change of view. *Idealismus* is still the author's professed support. His interest, however, is evidently enlisted in another subject, which was soon to engross it entirely. When we come to the second number of the periodical, there is more room

for doubt as to the extent to which his convictions have changed. He begins his warm advocacy of an art limited to Christian themes.<sup>11</sup> He points out that the great masters generally chose such themes, and used ancient mythology more by way of recreation from the serious business in hand. Contemporary painters, however, the author asserts, grope about from one field to another, with no definite connection. "Welch ein trauriger Zustand ist jetzt sichtbar!" This confusion of themes renders the "tiefere Natur-Allegorie und damit den eigentlichen Zweck der Malerei unmöglich." The author had evidently reached more definite conclusions on this matter than he cared to give at the time, for he promises a fuller discussion later, and while unkept promises were nothing unusual for Friedrich Schlegel, this was not to be among them.

Other things in this number might be adduced. The change he underwent also implied a subordination of the aesthetic to the religious point of view. Instances of this tendency could indeed be cited from an earlier period, and he was never poet enough to rest satisfied with a poet's philosophy. In the *Europa* he soon completely gives up the aesthetic for the religious orientation. The emphasis on allegory becomes more and more pronounced, as in the sentences just quoted the "tiefere Natur-Allegorie" becomes "der eigentliche Zweck der Malerei." The allegory in the *Rede über die Mythologie* is vaguer, more abstract, more philosophical; here art is the handmaiden of religion. In keeping with this tendency Friedrich Schlegel now writes the phrase "Wahrheit und Schönheit,"<sup>12</sup> and no longer "Schönheit und Wahrheit," an order still preserved in the *Vorrede* to the *Europa*. To those who have examined the kind of changes Friedrich Schlegel made in revising his works this observation will not be meaningless.

If the first number reveals no shift, and if the second merely hints at what is to come, the third leaves no doubt as to the matter. There the transition is complete. The first thing we notice is the redoubled emphasis on the esoteric character of art, its allegorical purpose, while the Christian religion is singled out

<sup>11</sup>*Europa*, I, 2, 15. For the discussion of these articles as art criticism see, Sulger-Gebing, A. W. und F. Schlegel in ihrem Verhältnisse zur bildenden Kunst, pp. 111-133.

<sup>12</sup> *Europa*, I, 2, 50.

with increasing certainty as its sole object. Landscapes should consist of arbitrary symbols to produce "lieblich bedeutende Symbole der weltumfassenden Religion." The aesthetic continually retires before the significant.<sup>13</sup> In the holy family of Bellini the mother is indeed less beautiful than the saints at her side, but she is more than beautiful; and the child is more than a mere child, it is "ein göttliches Kind." Close upon this passage follows a more detailed and unequivocal statement of the new position.<sup>14</sup> The author begins by saying that his descriptions of paintings have proceeded from one point of view, which he now wishes to explain, without forcing it upon anyone. (This statement alone has the value of a confession.) It would be easy, he says, to classify painting with the other arts and show its organic part in the evolution of human powers, but it is not worth the trouble, and besides it might lead to a serious misunderstanding.

Es ist nämlich die göttliche Kunst der Malerei etwas mehr als eine bloss nothwendige Entwicklung der menschlichen Natur, wie es zu seyn in einer Deduktion der Art scheinen musste. Eben darum weil es eine göttliche Kunst ist, müssen wir ihren Ursprung in der Freiheit und Willkühr suchen; deren Erfolg die Menschen zufällig zu nennen pflegen; denn nur die Nothwendigkeit und Notdurftigkeit kennend, und nur in dieser lebend, begreifen sie die höhere Kraft der Freiheit nur als Ausnahme von der gemeinen Regel. . . Ich will sagen, andre vielleicht recht nützliche Künste mögen nothwendig seyn, so, dass man mit Recht von ihnen sagen kann, sie mussten entstehen, sobald die Vernunft des Menschen und irgend eine materielle Bedingung gegeben war. Aber ferne sey es von uns, durch solcherlei Behauptung uns an der heiligen Kunst der Malerei zu vergehen: recht wohl könnte der Mensch ohne sie leben. Das System der an sein reines Wesen nothwendig geknüpften Bedingungen und nothwendig aus ihr [ihm?] hervorgehenden Kräfte würde dadurch nicht verändert oder unvollständig gemacht werden wohl aber würde ihm eins der wirksamsten Mittel fehlen sich mit dem Göttlichen zu verbinden, und sich der Gottheit zu nähern, wenn er dieser weit mehr als vernünftigen, sondern gottbegeisterten Kunst entbehrte. Überhaupt wäre es in diesem Falle und in jedem andern wohlgethan, wenn die Philosophie sich begnügte, das Göttliche was wirklich vorhanden ist, zu verstehen und auszudrücken, nicht aber es deducieren wollte, und eben damit seine Göttlichkeit vernichten und selbst durch eben diese Verkennung in den eigentlich so zu nennenden Atheismus versinken.

There is no Romantic irony here, no sublime arrogance nur-

<sup>13</sup> *Europa*, II, 1, 105 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Europa*, II, 1, 107 f.

tured on *Idealismus*. A new force is recognized as supreme—*das Göttliche*. It is rare that in revising his *Jugendschriften* Friedrich Schlegel allowed the word *göttlich* to stand as he originally used it. But he does not find it necessary to change the word in this passage,<sup>15</sup> because he uses it with full faith in its actual and positive significance. Moreover, as already mentioned, this identification of a certain philosophy with atheism is characteristic of his final period.<sup>16</sup>

The last number of the *Europa* opens in the same tone. In olden times, we are told, art always had in view the glorification of religion, and it should not lose sight of that object now. There follows a passage in which more unmistakably than before the ideal of beauty is subordinated to that of truth.<sup>17</sup> Religion and art are held to be inseparable. They must suggest not only that which is divine in itself, but the divine in human limitations—

d. h. sie müssen und sollen uns darstellen die tieferen Schmerzen der in der Sterblichkeit eingeschlossenen und auf dem himmlischen Rückwege allen Martern sich selbst freiwillig hingebenden höchsten Liebe. Das Marienbild und das Kreuzleiden, dieses sind die primitiven und mit allen ihren unendlich verschiedenen Ausdrücken, Variationen und Combinationen auch nie zu erschöpfenden Gegenstände . . . der höheren wahrhaften Malerei . . . eigentlich fordern sollte man aber von einem Kunstwerk nicht Reiz und Schönheit, sondern nur die hohe, ja göttliche Bedeutung.

Here, at least as far as painting is concerned, we have the desired mythology. "Versuchte man doch lieber auf dem gebahnten Wege der grossen alten Mahler Italiens und Deutschlands weiter fortzugehen; es würde wahrlich nicht an Stoff fehlen, und man würde sehr irren, wenn man glaubte, der Christliche Cyclus sey schon erschöpft!" Artists should return to the older way of tradition, out of the "Irrsaal moderner Aesthetik." Greek mythology should be used only by way of recreation from the sterner business of "mythische Allegorie." "Die Mythologie, ja die Religion der Alten war nun einmal durchaus sinnlich und materiell; begeisterte, trunkene Anbetung der unendlichen Lebenskraft und Naturfülle; allein beschränkt und gezügelt von dem bloss

<sup>15</sup> *S. W.* vi, 76 f.

<sup>16</sup> Windischmann, *op. cit.* I, 486-87, 491-92; II, 441, 442, 448, 480.

<sup>17</sup> *Europa*, II, 2, 16.

menschlichen Gesetz einer aus Erfahrung gereiften Mässigung und Verständlichkeit." This is apparently Friedrich Schlegel's first definite rejection of ancient mythology as a medium out of harmony with the Christian mind. It represents a complete reversal of the case for Greek mythology *versus* Christian mythology as upheld in the *Rede über die Mythologie*.

Hand in hand with the emphasis on Christian symbols and the esoteric character of art, goes the desire to promote a national style. Altdorfer and Dürer are continually glorified.<sup>18</sup> Occasion is also taken to contrast the former glory of German poetry with its present decadence. Wolfram von Eschenbach is referred to as "der grösste Dichter, den Deutschland jemals gehabt hat; doch unter dieser Bezeichnung möchten ihn nur wenige erkennen in dem Zeitalter des Undanks und der Vergessenheit altdeutschen Ruhms."

And at last the passage in which all these tendencies find full expression. Discussing the probability of a renaissance of art, the author says that while contemporary painters are deficient in technical ability, they chiefly lack "das innige und tiefe Gefühl." "Das religiöse Gefühl, Andacht und Liebe, und die innigste stille Begeisterung derselben war es, was den alten Malern die Hand führte." "Vergebens sucht ihr die Mahlerkunst wieder hervorzurufen, wenn nicht erst Religion oder philosophische Mystik wenigstens die Idee derselben wieder hervorgerufen hat." If this is too high a demand, let them at least study poetry: "Weniger die griechische Dichtkunst, die sie doch nur ins Fremde und Gelehrte verleitet . . . als die romantische."<sup>19</sup> Again the whole end of art is declared to be "symbolische Bedeutung und Andeutung göttlicher Geheimnisse." "Eine Hieroglyphe, ein göttliches Sinnbild soll jedes wahrhaft so zu nennende Gemälde seyn; die Frage ist aber nur ob der Mahler seine Allegorie sich selbst schaffen, oder aber sich an die alten Sinnbilder anschliessen soll, die durch Tradition gegeben und geheiligt sind, und die, recht verstanden, wohl tief und zureichend genug seyn möchten?" This way of tradition is held to be the safer, and especially does the older German style unite "den sicheren Weg der alten Wahrheit und das Hieroglyphische." It is better than the Italian style. "Denn

<sup>18</sup> *Europa*, II, 2, 112, 117.

<sup>19</sup> *Europa*, II, 2, 142 f.

die altdeutsche Malerei ist nicht nur im Mechanischen der Ausführung genauer und gründlicher, . . . sondern auch den ältesten, seltsamen und tief innigern Christlich catholischen Sinnbildern länger treu geblieben."

This seems to be the first use of the word "catholisch" in such connection, though it was not to be the last. For in later revisions of his works he supplemented the simple term "christliche Legende" by adding "und katholische Sinnbilder," in order to leave no doubt as to his meaning.<sup>20</sup>

From all these passages it is clear that Friedrich Schlegel had accepted the idea of revelation as his guiding principle. Unobtrusively introduced and gaining emphasis with each successive number, his thesis stands out plainly at the end. Art is allegorical, or symbolical. The truth to be symbolized is divine; its best expression is found in the Catholic tradition of the middle ages. The only thing needful is to return to that older tradition. The fact that the author did not change the word *göttlich* in the revised versions shows that he was employing it in its literal meaning, even if the whole tone and character of the context would not prove that anyway. It is therefore not surprising that in a confidential statement as early as 1804 Friedrich Schlegel said: "Dass die einzig ewig bestehende Wahrheit in der katholischen Kirche und alle anderen Systeme blosse Versuche seyen."<sup>21</sup>

Friedrich Schlegel's identification of *katholisch* with *mythologisch* occurred therefore first in the *Europa* and in the field of painting, and this formula was retained, though the art of painting was not always so exclusively exalted as in 1803. His attitude to a poetic mythology in theory and practice is systematically discussed in the well-known work of Fritz Strich, and need not be commented on here.<sup>22</sup>

Wesleyan University.

---

<sup>20</sup> Georg Schumann: *Fr. Schlegels Umarbeitung seiner Schriften für die Gesamtausgabe*, 1913, p. 34.

<sup>21</sup> Windischmann, *op. cit.* II, 540.

<sup>22</sup> *Mythologie in der deutschen Dichtung von Klopstock bis Wagner*. 1910. Esp. II, 56 f., 83 f., 160 f. It might be well to call attention to the fact that a significant part of the passage quoted by the author (II, 57) from the Boccaccio essay, does not belong to the version of 1801, as there implied, but was added much later.



## NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

---

### NOTES ON *FULGENS AND LUCRES*: NEW LIGHT ON THE INTERLUDE

Henry Medwall's long lost play, *Fulgens and Lucres*, unearthed in 1920 in the Huntington Library,<sup>1</sup> contains a bit of interesting evidence regarding the social condition of actors about the year 1500 and throws new light on the origin of the term interlude. Notwithstanding its obvious value to students of the drama, the old play has been singularly neglected since its resurrection.

The title page announces that "Here is cōteyned a godely interlude of Fulgens Cenatoure of Rome. Lucres his daughter. Gayus flaminus. & Publi. Corneli. of the disputacyon of noblenes. & is devyded in two ptyes, to be played at ii tymes. Cōpyled by mayster Henry medwall. late chapelayne to ye right reuerent fader in god John Morton cardynall & Archebyssshop of Caunterbury."<sup>2</sup> The play has been dated by Mr. De Ricci, its recent editor, at about 1500. In form it is a *debat* over the relative merits of high birth without individual attainment or low birth with individual accomplishment. Modernly enough, the award of the lady's hand goes to the worthy but low born knight possessed of those virtues that lead to success. Originally the play was designed for some banquet in a noble house, probably at court. Perhaps the exaltation of the idea of sterling virtue overcoming even inherited position was intended as a subtle compliment to Henry Tudor, but that is matter for the allegorist.

An impression seems current among students of the early English drama that professional actors occupied a parlous position in the social order before Shakespeare lent dignity to the stage. The various mandates of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, curbing the activities of "players, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars," are cited in proof of the wretched condition of actors. One is likely to get the impression that the only actors who made a success before

<sup>1</sup> De Ricci, Seymour (ed.), *Fulgens and Lucres*, by Henry Medwall. The Henry E. Huntington Facsimile Reprints (New York, 1920).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

Shakespeare and Alleyn were the non-professional choir-boy actors. It is this impression that an allusion in *Fulgens and Lucrez* refutes.

The play opens with a preamble between two characters designated only as A and B. A asks if B is one of the actors in the play to follow, and when the latter denies it, he remarks that actors have come to dress so splendidly that it is difficult to tell an actor from any other gallant:<sup>3</sup>

- A. I trowe your owyn selfe be oon  
Of them that shall play.
- B. Nay I am none.  
I trowe thou spekyst in derision  
To lyke me ther to.
- A. Nay I mok not wot ye well  
For I thought verely by your apparell  
That ye had bene a player
- B. Nay neuer a dell.
- A. Than I cry you mercy.  
I was to blame lo therefore I say  
There is somyche nyce aray  
Amonges these galandis now aday  
That a man shall not lightly  
Know a player from a nother man, etc.

Certainly this must be a reference to the growing prosperity among professional actors. It can not refer to the boy actors. The allusion is clearly to adult actors who seem to have been in a more prosperous condition during the first years of the sixteenth century than is generally realized.

More interesting than this, however, is the manner of presentation of *Fulgens and Lucrez*, and the suggestion it carries with it of the original meaning of the term interlude. The early scholars asserted that the term interlude had its origin in the fact that these plays were at times performed in the intervals of banquets or other entertainments.<sup>4</sup> Later Chambers sought to refute this

<sup>3</sup> Sig. Aiii verso.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ward, A. W., *History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* (London, 1899), I, 108: "It seems (the term interlude) to have been applied to plays performed by professional actors from the time of Edward IV onwards. Its origin is doubtless to be found in the fact that such plays were occasionally performed in the intervals of banquets

belief by asserting that "the force of *inter* in the combination has been misunderstood and that an *interludium* is not a ludus in the intervals of something else, but a ludus carried on between (inter) two or more performers; in fact, a ludus in dialogue."<sup>5</sup>

In spite of the commonsense logic of this explanation, we have in *Fulgens and Lucrez* a play that exactly fits the older conception of interlude. The title assures one that the play is a "godely interlude" to be played at two times. It is evident that the two parts must be played close to each other, as the division is arbitrary, and a recollection of the first part is necessary to an understanding of the second part. The context explains that the two parts furnished amusement for a banquet. After a great deal of clownery between A, B, and Ancilla, the first part of the interlude ends with an explanation that the audience is growing hungry and the remainder of the play will be given after the spectators' hunger is satisfied:<sup>6</sup>

These folke that sitt here in the halle  
 May not attende there to  
 Whe may not with oure long play  
 Lett them fro theyre dyner all day  
 Thay have not fully dyned.  
 For and this play where ones ouere past (sic)  
 Some of them wolde falle to fedyng as fast  
 As they had bene almost pyned.  
 . . . . .  
 And therefore we shall the matter for bere  
 And make apoynt euyng here.  
 Lest we excede a mesure  
 And we shall do oure labour & trewe entent  
 For to play the remenant  
 At my Lordis pleasure.  
 Finis prime partis

That the interval between the first and second part of the interlude is not long is evident from A's remark at the opening of the second part that he has had to make great haste to get back in time for the performance. As he announces the opening of the

and entertainments, which of course would have been out of the question in the case of religious plays proper."

<sup>5</sup> Chambers, E. K., *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), II, 183.

<sup>6</sup> *Fulgens and Lucrez*, Sig. E i verso. A is speaking.

second half of the play, he reminds the audience that their wits are not so short that they can not remember what was played when they "where at dyner."<sup>7</sup> Obviously the concluding portion of the play came just at the end of the bulk of the meal, the next logical place after the beginning of an early Tudor banquet, and probably the diners remained seated about the tables in the great hall, engaged in drinking, the conclusion of every formal meal.

Thus early in the development of the interlude as a dramatic form there is an example of the genre which fulfills the conditions that scholars before Chambers held to be the source of the term. *Fulgens and Lucres* is styled an interlude by its author; it is designed for representation in the intervals of a banquet. Whatever the generalized term, interlude, came to mean, perhaps Ward and the older scholars were right in their explanation of the term.

*University of North Carolina.*

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

### A REPLY

In reply to Prof. B. Seuffert's review (*MLN.*, April, 1925) of my edition of Goethe's *Lyrics*, I should like to submit the following corrections:

In making a selection from Goethe's *Lyrics* I had to adapt myself to the general plan of the older edition and was restricted with regard to the size of the book. This is the reason why I could not incorporate more of the *Zahme Xenien* and other poems.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Sig. E i:

"But now to the matter that I cam fore  
 Ye know the cause thereof before  
 Your wittis be not so short  
 Perde my felowys and I were here  
 Today whan ye where at dyner  
 And shewed you a lytell disport  
 Of one fulgens and his doughter lucres  
 And of ii men that made grett besyness  
 Her husbonde for to be  
 . . . . .  
 Dyuers toyes mengled yn the same  
 To styre folke to myrthe and game," etc.

The poem *Ilmenau* was given a prominent place by Goethe himself and heads the group *An Personen* (W. 2, 141).

The lines addressed to Tina Brühl I included because I felt that Goethe should also be represented as a humorist in an edition of this kind.

I adopted the version: "Sinds Rosen, nun sie werden blühn"—which is also to be found in the *Jubilaums-Ausgabe*,—because this kind of conditional, far from being "ungoethisch," occurs quite often in Goethe's later works; thus *e. g.*: "Wärens Bücher, sagt er, ich würd' sie nicht lesen" (W. 2, 273): "Wärens Könige gewesen. . ." (W. 5, 1, 153); "Wills der Ozean zerschellen" (W. 5, 279). "Nun" a favorite patchword, occurs twice in succession in *Faust II*, 10087-88. Another reason why this version seemed to me preferable, is the fact that "nun" is after all, better fitted for the arsis of the second iambic foot than "und." A definite settlement is not possible, as long as no conclusive proof with regard to Goethe's own preference has been found.

The expression *Zentrale Gliederung* has become quite common in connection with methods of interpretation which, apart from Herder and romantic criticism, were employed by Dilthey and nowadays by Gundolf and his followers; however, I have shown already many years ago that Goethe himself prefers to regard the human mind as centrally organized: "Der Geist schiesst aus dem Zentrum seine Radien nach der Peripherie" (*Annalen*, W. 36, 22).

The significance of Klopstock as the first German lyric poet who discovered the natural musical and rhythmical properties of the German language (as contrasted with the laws of prosody), has been admirably set forth by K. Burdach in his essay on Schiller's Chordrama (mentioned in the notes) and very recently by F. Gundolf in his Klopstock oration (Heidelberg, 1924). Since Goethe in this respect follows Klopstock's example, it seems perfectly justified to say that his hymns are unthinkable without Klopstock's Odes.

The statement that it was the mission of German idealism to overcome the spirit of Rationalism (*die Überwindung der Aufklärung*), has become a commonplace in most philosophical textbooks; it suffices to refer to Windelband's *History of Modern Philosophy* (vol. 2, p. 2). In a book by P. Kluckhohn on *Die deutsche Romantik* (Leipzig 1924) I find the following sentence: "Gerade

in der Überwindung der Aufklärung liegt ein wesentliches Verdienst des deutschen Geisteslebens um 1800, der idealistischen Philosophie und der Romantik." I have dealt more fully with this whole question in an essay which introduces the new edition of H. Hettner's *History of the Literature of the 18th century* ("Aufklärung, Klassik und Romantik." Braunschweig 1925).

The expression "Zonen" is frequently used and explained in Gundolf's *Goethe* and goes together with the conception of *Zentrale Gliederung*.

I cannot see how any kind of analysis can be undertaken without some outward method of classification; I have certainly emphasized over and over again that this method should only be regarded as a means to an end and that the different groups which are represented in my scheme, merely designate certain prevailing types or tendencies and nothing more.

For a comparison between Strindberg and Goethe I would suggest the reading of Strindberg's novel *By the open sea*, with its microscopic observations of deep-sea life, as contrasted with Goethe's larger vision and his constant effort to discover permanent types and *Urphänomene* in nature and life.

There is no doubt that Goethe undertook the revision of his elegies and in particular of *Alexis und Dora* at the suggestion of A. W. Schlegel; Goethe conferred with him orally and by letter all the time he was working on these metrical problems. A. W. Schlegel's own corrections are reproduced in the Weimar edition (1, 425); for a full discussion of this question see A. Heusler: *Deutscher und antiker Vers*, p. 97 (Strassb. 1917). Heusler likewise holds Schlegel responsible.

E. A. BOUCKE.

Heidelberg.

### NOTES ON THREE SONNETS OF BOSCAÍN

On re-reading recently the sonnets of Juan Boscán, I noted a few imitations of Petrarch which were not mentioned by Menéndez y Pelayo<sup>1</sup> in his study of the literary relations between the two

<sup>1</sup> *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1908, XIII, 281-284.

poets, and so far as I know, attention has not been called to them elsewhere.

In his sonnet 233, Petrarch calls upon his thoughts to grant him respite; Love, Fortune, and Death wage war upon him, but his heart which admits them is alone guilty.

Datemi pace, o duri miei pensieri:  
 Non basta ben ch'Amor, Fortuna e Morte  
 Mi fanno guerra intorno e'n su le porte,  
 Senza trovarmi dentro altri guerreri?  
 E tu, mio cor, ancor se' pur qual eri,  
 Disleal a me sol; chè fere scorte  
 Vai ricettando, e se' fatto consorte  
 De' miei nemici sì pronti e leggieri.  
 In te i secreti suoi messaggi Amore,  
 In te spiega Fortuna ogni sua pompa,  
 E Morte la memoria di quel colpo  
 Che l'avanzo di me convèn che rompa;  
 In te i vaghi pensier s'arman d'errore:  
 Per che d'ogni mio mal te solo incolpo.

In his thirteenth sonnet, Boscán limits himself to an imitation of the first quatrain and the first tercet.<sup>2</sup>

Dexadme en paz, o duros pensamientos!  
 Básteos el daño y la vergüenza hecha.  
 Si todo lo he pasado, qué aprovecha  
 Inventar sobre mí nuevos tormentos?  
 Natura en mí perdió sus movimientos;  
 El alma ya a los pies del dolor se echa;  
 Tiene por bien en regla tan estrecha,  
 A tantos casos tantos sufrimientos.  
 Amor, fortuna y muerte, que es presente,  
 Me llevan a la fin por sus jornadas,  
 Y a mi cuenta debería ser llegado.  
 Yo quando acaso afoxa el accidente,  
 Si vuelvo el rostro y miro las pisadas,  
 Tiemblo de ver por donde me han pasado.

In his one hundred and second sonnet, Petrarch tries by a series of questions to reconcile the contrary effects of Love, but without success.

S' Amor non è, che dunque è quel ch'io sento?  
 Ma s'egli è Amor, per dio, che cosa e quale?

---

<sup>2</sup> W. I. Knapp, *Las obras de Juan Boscán*, Madrid, 1875.

Se buona, ond'è l'effetto aspro mortale?  
 Se ria, ond'è sì dolce ogni tormento?  
 S'a mia voglia ardo, ond'è 'l pianto e lamento?  
 S'a mal mio grado, il lamentar che vale?  
 O viva morte, o diletto male,  
 Come puoi tanto in me, s'io nol consento?  
 E s'io 'l consento, a gran torto mi doglio.  
 Fra sì contrari venti, in frale barca  
 Mi trovo in alto mar, senza governo,  
 Sì lieve di saver, d'error sì carica,  
 Ch'ì medesimo non so quel ch'io mi voglio;  
 E tremo a mezza state, ardendo il verno.


Boscán makes use of the same artifice in his fifty-fifth sonnet, with a change of ideas in the tercets.

Bueno es amar? pues cómo daña tanto?  
 Gran gusto es querer bien? por qué entristece?  
 Placer es desear? cómo aborrece?  
 Amor es nuestro bien? por qué da llanto?  
 Da esfuerzo amar? pues cómo causa espanto?  
 Por el amor, el bien del alma crece?  
 Pues, cómo así por él ella padece?  
 Cómo tantos contrarios cubre un manto?  
 No es el amor el que dolor nos trae;  
 La compañía que a su pesar él tiene,  
 También a su pesar nos hiere y mata.  
 El mal en él de nuestra parte cae;  
 El sólo en nuestro bando nos sostiene  
 Y nuestra paz continuamente trata.

In sonnet 188 Petrarch declares that if his sufferings lead him to death, Laura will be responsible for it.

S'una fede amorosa, un cor non finto,  
 Un languir dolce, un desiar cortese;  
 S'oneste voglie in gentil foco accese;  
 Un lungo error in cieco laberinto;  
 Se ne la fronte ogni penser depinto,  
 Od in voci interrotte a pena intese,  
 Or da paura, or da vergogna offese;  
 S'un pallor di viola e d'amor tinto;  
 S'aver altrui più caro che sè stesso;  
 Se sospirare e lagrimar mai sempre,  
 Pascendosi di duol, d'ira e d'affanno;  
 S'arder da lunge, ed agghiacciar da presso,  
 Son le cagion ch'amando i'mi distempre;  
 Vostro, Donna, 'l peccato, e mio fia 'l danno.



 Boscán translates this almost literally in his fifty-seventh sonnet.

Si un corazón de un verdadero amante,  
 Y un contino morir por contentaros,  
 Y un estender mi alma en deseos,  
 Y un encogirme, si os estoy delante;  
 Y si un penar con un sufrir constante,  
 Satisfecho y contento con miraros,  
 Y un derramar mis pasos por buscaros,  
 Preguntando por vos a cada instante;  
 Y si un tener mi razonar compuesto,  
 Y en hablándoos sin más luego turbarme,  
 Con un grande embarazo y desvarío:  
 Los accidentes son, que han de llevarme  
 Con público pregón a morir presto,  
 La culpa es vuestra y el dolor es mío.

University of Pennsylvania. J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

### NEGLECTED VERSE BY 'THE ABBÉ DE CHAULIEU.

Several biographers of the Abbé de Chaulieu<sup>1</sup> have indicated the year 1680 as the probable date of his entrance into the service of the brothers de Vendôme,<sup>2</sup> as secretary and financial adviser. Since he was entirely unfit for these charges, which were, moreover, far from exhausting, he joined about that time the *Société du Temple* and became a most assiduous guest at its never ending feasts of wine and wit. An unpublished satirical strophe of the jocular Abbé substantiates this date. It was written in 1680, according to a date in the margin of the MS. and its text as well as the contemporary notes which accompany it, make it clear that at that moment he was already "supervisor of the private pleasures" of the brothers de Vendôme.

Ms. *Recueil de Chansons choisies en Vaudevilles* (early 18th century) in my possession, vol. I, f. 15:

<sup>1</sup> For instance, Fr. Schwarzkopf, *Coulanges, Chaulieu und La Fare*, 1908, p. 37. J. Gravigny, *Abbés galants et libertins*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The Duke Louis-Joseph, 1654-1712 and Philippe, *Grand Prieur* of the order of Malta, 1655-1727.

1680 Belle Mouchy par tes manières<sup>3</sup>  
 Au Grand Prieur tu ne peux plaire,<sup>4</sup>  
 Quand il te voit tromper Conty;<sup>5</sup>  
 Ne luy vante plus ta tendresse  
 Car il est plus fidèle amy  
 Que tu n'es fidèle maîtresse.

On accusoit l'Abbé de Chaulieu, factotum de M. le Grand Prieur d'avoir fait le couplet cy dessus.

An answer to this epigram was circulated at the time:

F. 22. *Sur l'Abbé de Chaulieu de chez M. le Grand Prieur de Vendôme qui avoit fait sur la duchesse d'Humières le couplet "Belle Mouchy."*

Chaulieu, ta veine téméraire  
 Insulte la belle d'Humières,  
 Toy pour qui jamais Appolon  
 Ne ressentit que de la haine  
 Et dont le cidre de Vernon  
 Fut toujours le seul hypocène.

To these epigrams I add some neglected verse of de Chaulieu, which has escaped the attention of his several editors. It dates from his last years when he was, although eighty and blind, still indefatigably in love with choice fare, licentious songs and Mlle de Launay<sup>6</sup> and occurs in a very rare volume,<sup>7</sup> published by her: *Suite des Divertissemens de Seaux, contenant des Chansons, des Cantates et autres Pièces de Poésies* (sic). *Avec la description des Nuits qui s'y sont données, et les Comédies qui s'y sont jouées.* . . . Paris, 1725. On p. 55 is found a song by M. Malézieux,<sup>8</sup> *De*

<sup>3</sup> "Mlle de Mouchy, fille du Maréchal d'Humières, femme de M. le M. de Chappes, second fils du duc d'Aumon, qui prit le nom de duc d'Humières."  
 —Note of the ms.

<sup>4</sup> Philippe de Vendôme.

<sup>5</sup> "Le Prince de Conty, père."—Note of the ms.

<sup>6</sup> Later Mme de Staël author of the well-known *Mémoires*.

<sup>7</sup> See, *Catalogue Soleinne*, 3511, where it is styled "très rare et presque inconnu aux bibliographes," and Barbier, *Dict. des Ouvr. anonymes*, who calls it a "volume fort rare."

<sup>8</sup> Nicolas de Malézieux, 1650-1729, politician and occasional poet. Most of his verse is found in the *Divertissemens de Seaux*, 1712, and in the volume here referred to.

*M. de Malézieu, pour M. l'Abbé de Chaulieu, en lui envoyant du vin vieux, to which de Chaulieu wrote an answer:*

*Réponse de M. l'Abbé de Chaulieu.*

*Sur l'air, Dans ce couvent bienheureux.*

Je n'accepte pas encore,  
 Un vin vieux pour mon symbole:  
 Ta gentille parabole  
 Pourroit bien me faire tort:  
 Tant que de sa phrénésie  
 Phoebus trouble mon cerveau,  
 Je veux que ma Poésie  
 Sente encore le vin nouveau!  
 Ne parlons jamais ici  
 Et d'automne et de vieillesse:  
 Le printemps et la jeunesse  
 En banissent le souci:  
 Tandis que je vois du Maine,<sup>9</sup>  
 Et que j'entends ses discours,  
 La voix de cette Sirène,  
 De mes ans suspend le cours!

In the same volume, pp. 6-13, was published one of Chaulieu's poems, *Ode à la Louange de l'Imagination* with a versified *Introduction* singing the praises of the Duchesse du Maine, the most praised lady of French literature. The poem itself is found in Chaulieu's collected works (1777, II, p. 30), but without an *Introduction* of 17 lines, which preceded it in the original version.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

*Columbia University.*

#### GOETHE'S *FAUST*, 4203-4205

Concerning the founding of the monastery at Montserrat in Spain Bayard Taylor recounts the following legend.<sup>1</sup>

The chapel when built was intrusted to the pious care of Fray Juan Guarin. . . . The Devil, however, interfered. . . . He first entered into Riquilda, the daughter of the Count of Barcelona, and then declared through her mouth that he would not quit her body except by the order

<sup>9</sup> The Duchesse du Maine.

<sup>1</sup> *By-Ways of Europe* (1887), p. 167 f.

of Juan Guarin, . . . Riquilda was therefore sent to the mountain and given into the hermit's charge. A temptation similar to that of St. Anthony followed, but with exactly the opposite result. In order to conceal his sin, Juan Guarin cut off Riquilda's head, buried her, and fled. Overtaken by remorse, he made his way to Rome, confessed himself to the Pope, and prayed for a punishment proportioned to his crime. He was ordered to become a beast, never lifting his face towards heaven, until the hour when God Himself should signify his pardon.

Juan Guarin went forth . . . on his hands and knees, crawled back to Montserrat, and lived there seven years as a wild animal, . . . The hunters of the court snared him as a strange beast, . . . and took him to Barcelona. In the mansion of the count there was an infant only five months old, . . . No sooner had the child beheld the supposed animal, than it gave a loud cry and exclaimed: "Rise up, Juan Guarin; God has pardoned thee!" . . . the beast rose up and spoke in a human tongue. He told his story, and the Count set out at once with him to the spot where Riquilda was buried. They opened the grave and the maiden rose up alive, with only a rosy mark, like a thread, around her neck.

It seems strange that the description of the resurrected Riquilda did not suggest to the translator of *Faust* the appearance of the vision of Gretchen in the *Walpurgisnacht* scene.<sup>2</sup>

Wie sonderbar muss diesen schönen Hals  
Ein einzig rotes Schnürchen schmücken  
Nicht weiter als ein Messerrücken!

The question arises whether it be not possible, or even probable, that the author of the *Faust* had the Riquilda episode in mind when he wrote the verses just cited.

It is a fact universally known that the *Walpurgisnacht* was written between November, 1800, and February, 1801.<sup>3</sup> The manuscript of the greater part of the scene which is in the Berliner Staatsbibliothek bears at the end of the second page, in Goethe's hand, the date of November 5, 1800.<sup>4</sup> The third and fourth pages are dated February, 9th and 10th, 1801.<sup>4</sup>

It is further well known that Wilhelm von Humboldt's travels in Spain, his visits to Montserrat, and especially his description of the latter place, not only aroused Goethe's interest and enthusiasm,

<sup>2</sup> *Faust*, 4203 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See Calvin Thomas, *Faust I*, p. 325; also Georg Witkowski, *Die Walpurgisnacht im ersten Teil von Goethes Faust*, Leipzig, 1894, S. 14 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Witkowski, *loc. cit.*

but made such a deep impression upon him that, for years afterwards, the magic word Montserrat continued to vibrate in his memory and find echo in his writings.<sup>5</sup>

Now it happens that the time of Goethe's most lively interest in Montserrat coincides exactly with the composition of the *Walpurgisnacht*. As early as January 4, 1800, he writes to Humboldt:<sup>6</sup>

Was ich Ihnen schrieb, dass mir Ihre Reise nach Spanien statt einer eigenen dahin gelten würde, geht wirklich schon durch Ihren letzten Brief in Erfüllung. . . .

So habe ich auch einige Reisebeschreibungen mit mehrerem Antheil durchblättert. Eine Karte von Spanien ist an meine Thür angenagelt und so begleite ich Sie in Gedanken, und hoffe, dass Sie mich nach und nach immer weiter führen werden.

But it was not until the end of August, 1800, that Goethe received Humboldt's essay, *Der Montserrat bei Barcelona*.<sup>7</sup>

On the second of September Goethe sent the essay to Schiller.<sup>8</sup> Two weeks later he informs Humboldt:<sup>9</sup> "Durch Ihren Montserrat haben Sie uns ein grosses Vergnügen gemacht. Die Darstellung ist gut geschrieben, man liest sie gern und man kann sie aus der Einbildungskraft nicht los werden. Ich befinde mich seit der Zeit, ehe ich michs versehe, bey einem oder dem anderen Ihrer Eremiten."

Although Humboldt's essay contains an account of the Riquilda miracle, it omits alone the fact, so important for our purpose, that the restored maiden had a rosy mark around her neck, and confines itself to the statement:<sup>10</sup> "Wie man dasselbe (das Grab) öffnet, steigt die Erschlagene lebendig und blühender als sie vorher war, aus der Erde empor." Since this omission occurs in the first<sup>11</sup> as well as in the most recent printing of the essay, it seems best

<sup>5</sup> E. g., *Werke* (Weimar Ausgabe), 41, 102, 105; 49, 160.

<sup>6</sup> *Werke* (Weimar Ausgabe), Brief No. 4175. See also Bratranek, *Goethes Briefwechsel mit den Gebrüdern von Humboldt*, Leipzig, 1876, S. 154 f.

<sup>7</sup> See Humboldt's letter to Goethe, Paris, 18. August 1800, *Goethe-jahrbuch*, xxxi (1910), S. 54.

<sup>8</sup> *Werke*, iv, 15, 99, No. 4280.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, S. 103, No. 4285.

<sup>10</sup> *Wilhelm von Humboldts Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, 1904, iii, 42 f.

<sup>11</sup> In the *Allgemeine geographische Ephemeriden*, hrsg. von Gaspari u. Bertuch, Bd. xi, Stück 3, S. 215-313.

to conclude that this detail was not contained in the original manuscript (no longer extant), the form in which Goethe became acquainted with the story. While we assume that the manuscript underwent no amendment in the period of almost three years, from the time it was received by Goethe until it came into the hands of the typesetters, we must call attention to the fact that already as early as August, 1800, Humboldt was considering, not only an abbreviation, but the total elimination of the *Legende Guarins* from his essay.<sup>12</sup>

But even if Goethe did not get this device of the girl with the "rosy ring" around her neck from Humboldt,<sup>13</sup> he most certainly met it in other descriptions of Montserrat. In a foot-note to his essay<sup>14</sup> Humboldt informs his reader: "Ausführlich findet man die Geschichte des Montserrats in Fr. Antonio de Yepes *cronica general de la Orden de S. Benito*, 1609, Vol. 4, fol. 224 u. f. in Petrus de Marca (*Limes Hispan.* l. 3, app. § 3, p. 337.) und Florez *España sagrada* erzählt. . . . Von Christoval Virues epischem Gedicht über die Gründung des Klosters dessen Cervantes bei der Sichtung der Büchersammlung Don Quixote's mit grossen, und (man kann mit Recht hinzufügen) übermässigen Lobsprüchen erwähnt, gebe ich Ihnen ein andermal einige Nachricht." We can not determine whether Goethe read these accounts, but, if he did, he found in the first-named the miracle related thus:<sup>15</sup> "Aqui renouô nuestro Señor sus maravillas: porque por merecimientos de la Virgen Maria à la donzella hallaron viua, sana, y hermosa. Y para muestra del milagro, se via en ella la señal que avia hecho el cuchillo, en forma de un hilo de seda de grana." The second account contains no details helpful to our purpose. Slightly more helpful is the passage in Florez. He narrates: "fueron al lugar que les mostró, y la hallaron, con nuevo asombro, viva, sana y agraciada con una como cinta encarnada al cuello, que era la señal de la sangre vertida al degollarla."

That Goethe did read other descriptions of Montserrat besides the one sent him by Humboldt we know from his own words. On

<sup>12</sup> *Goethejahrbuch* xxxi (1910), S. 57.

<sup>13</sup> The same omission of the "rosy ring" occurs in his *Tagebuch der Reise nach Spanien 1799-1800, Schriften*, Bd. 15 (1918), S. 309.

<sup>14</sup> *Schriften*, loc. cit., S. 42 f.

<sup>15</sup> F. 226.

the fifteenth of September, 1800, he writes to Humboldt: <sup>16</sup> "Ich suchte gestern den Montserrat in einer spanischen Reise auf und es war eben so gut wie gar nichts. Fast glaube ich der Reisebeschreiber ist nicht oben gewesen." This description I have not been able to identify, but a man who had never climbed the mountain would be just the one whom we might expect to supplement his description with a full account of the legend.

Humboldt himself requested of Goethe: <sup>17</sup> "Auch wünschte ich Sie könnten Ticknors <sup>18</sup> Reise nachlesen und mir sagen, wie seine Schilderung des Montserrats sich zu meiner verhält. Er soll die ausführlichste unter allen Reisebeschreibern haben, und ich habe ihn leider hier nicht auftreiben können." To this request Goethe replies on the nineteenth of November, 1800, <sup>19</sup> "Den Thicknesse über den Montserrat müssen Sie nothwendig lesen und die Vergleichung selbst anstellen. Er ist ausführlich genug, doch scheint mir der Gegenstand durch Ihre Ansicht wieder neu zu werden." Thus we see that at the very time he was writing the *Walpurgisnacht* Goethe was reading Thicknesse's description of Montserrat, or had read it so recently that it was still fresh in his memory.

The part of the story in which our interest centers Thicknesse recounts thus: <sup>20</sup> "genug sei es zu sagen, dass der Graf mit Guerin hingieng den Körper der ermordeten Prinzessin aufzusuchen, um solche bey ihren Voreltern zu begraben; aber zu ihrem grossen Erstaunen, fanden sie dieselbe lebendig, in eben der Jugend und Schönheit, die sie sonst gehabt hatte, ohne die geringste Veränderung, ausser einem Purpur-Streif um den Hals, da wo der Strick mit dem sie von Guerin gewürgt worden war, gewesen war."

<sup>16</sup> *Werke*, iv, 15, 104, No. 4285.

<sup>17</sup> Paris, 10. Oct., 1800, Bratranek, No. 31, S. 170.

<sup>18</sup> This name, which Bratranek gives, in the incorrect form, is, as the editor of the Weimar Goethe points out, Thicknesse, Philip. The work which the Weimar editor could not find (iv, 15, S. 332) has long since been correctly given by Karl Engel *Zusammenstellung der Faustschriften vom 16 Jahrhundert bis Mitte 1884. Der Bibliotheca Faustiana vom Jahre 1874, zweite Auflage*, Oldenburg, 1885. (See *Goethejahrbuch* vii, S. 35/2 (1886)). The title page of the work in the edition from which I quote reads: *Philipp Thicknesses Reisen durch Frankreich, und einen Theil von Catalonien. Aus dem Englischen*, Leipzig, 1778.

<sup>19</sup> *Werke*, xv, 15, 147, No. 4316.

<sup>20</sup> *Loc. cit.*, S. 109.

So here, if not elsewhere, had Goethe read of the resurrected girl with the rosy mark around her neck. Although Taylor and the Spaniards describe the mark as—nicht weiter als ein Messerrücken,—here it is nicht weiter als “der Strick mit dem sie gewürgt worden war”—not a very great difference in dimension,—and, even granting that Goethe knew no form of the story which, true to the original, makes a knife rather than a cord the instrument of the maiden’s death, none too wide a leap for the imagination of a Goethe, especially since the “thickness of a knife’s blade” rather than that of a piece of cord was better suited to his purpose. In other words, Gretchen appears to Faust not, as Riquilda to Guarin, triumphant over death, but doomed to die at the hands of the public executioner. Hence the poet must suggest the relation between the “rosy ring” around Gretchen’s neck and the blade of the knife. It is this last fact which gives special weight to Witkowski’s hypothesis that Goethe was influenced by a passage in Erasmus Francisci’s *Höllischer Proteus*<sup>21</sup> when he wrote verse 4204.<sup>22</sup> In support of his thesis Witkowski cites the following from Francisci:<sup>23</sup> “Aber das Beste und der fürnehmste Schatz, welchen ihm (dem Hexenmeister) der Teufel aufhebt, und endlich zugeschanzt, ist diesen (*sic!*), dass er ihm, durch die Beschwerden, eine rote Korallen-Schnur von Blut um den Hals zu wegen gebracht, als den rechten Werth solcher Künste. Denn das gerichtlichergangene Urteil hat ihn, solcher Beschwerden wegen zum Schwerdt verdammt.”

Undoubtedly this narration has features in common with the situation found in *Faust*, 4204. The other passage from the same work quoted by Witkowski:<sup>24</sup> “Ohnköpftiges Gespenst bedeutet einer Kindesmörderin die Enthauptung”<sup>24</sup> and the stories referred

<sup>21</sup> Nürnberg, 1708. For full title see Witkowski, *opus cit.*, S. 18.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Witkowski, *loc. cit.*, S. 19 f.

<sup>23</sup> Francisci, *opus cit.*, S. 929. Cf. also Witkowski’s note to *Faust*, 4204, in his edition 2. Bd. S. 273. “Dass Enthauptete, die wiederbelebt werden, eine feine rote Linie um den Hals haben, ist ein in Sage und Dichtung mehrfach angewandtes charakteristisches Merkmal. Goethe kam dazu wohl durch den Ausdruck bei Francisci, dass der Teufel einem Hexenmeister eine rote Korallenschnur um den Hals zuwege gebracht habe, d. h. er sei hingetötet worden.”

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, Blattzeiger unter O.



to, but not quoted,<sup>25</sup> suggest, in a way, verses 4206-4207 rather than 4204. Since Witkowski has demonstrated beyond dispute that this book, which Goethe is known to have used about the time of the composition of the *Walpurgisnacht*, has left its marks on other parts of the Blocksberg scene, it were futile to attempt to deny that there exists a possible relation between Francisci's work and *Faust*, 4203 ff.

But it seems even more futile to attempt to deny not only a possible, but even a probable, relation between these verses and the Riquilda episode. We have seen that Goethe read the story at the very time he was writing this scene. We know that his interest in Montserrat was at this time at its highest. It is an open secret that he availed himself of descriptions of Montserrat in his composition of the *Bergschluchten* scene in the fifth act of *Faust II*, which scene was also composed about 1800.<sup>26</sup> True, the situation represented in the resurrection of Riquilda is as far surpassed in poetic and aesthetic qualities by the situation pictured in the appearance of Gretchen to Faust as it in turn surpasses the coarse hocus-pocus depicted in the Hexenmeister episode in the extract cited from the *Höllischer Proteus*. Nevertheless, we think that the Gretchen episode has more details in common with the Spanish legend than with the Francisci narrative.

In the *Faust*, as in the Spanish story, there appears in the heights of a lonely mountain (Blocksberg, Montserrat), as if resurrected from the dead,<sup>27</sup> a young woman<sup>28</sup> "in eben der Jugend und Schönheit, die sie sonst gehabt hatte"<sup>29</sup> to the man who had deprived her of her maidenly innocence and who is the cause (indirect or direct) of her premature and violent death (or impending death). Both men were seduced to their wickedness by the machinations of an incarnate devil.<sup>30</sup> The visionary (or reincarnate)

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, S. 399 u. S. 400.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Calvin Thomas, *Faust II* and Karl Engel, *opus cit.*

<sup>27</sup> *Faust*, 4195 ff. Fürwahr, es sind die Augen eines Toten,  
Die eine liebende Hand nicht schloss.

<sup>28</sup> *Faust*, 4184. Ein blasses schönes Kind.

<sup>29</sup> Thiekness, 109. See *supra*, p. 111; cf. *Faust*, 4197 f.  
Das ist die Brust, die Gretchen mir geboten,  
Das ist der süsse Leib, den ich genoss.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Thiekness, *opus cit.*, S. 107 f. "Ich muss Ihnen also melden,

figure has around its neck a narrow "rosy ring" (ein rotes Schnürchen; Purpur-Streif, da wo der Strick gewesen war) made by the instrument which is to cause (or has caused) its death. If we can assume that Goethe knew the original version of the story, this instrument was in both cases a knife. (Yepes, el cuchillo; Font,<sup>31</sup> el cuchillo; Goethe, Messerrücken.)

But even if Goethe knew only Thicknesse's version of the story, the parallel is close enough to allow us to conclude that the visionary Gretchen who appears on the Blocksberg is, not necessarily a child, no, not even of necessity a relative, but, nevertheless, probably a distant descendant of the resurrected Riquilda of Montserrat. Of course, it can be that the resemblance which exists between this golden-haired daughter of Protestant Germany and the raven-locked child of Catholic Spain is purely accidental. But the creator of a *Weltliteratur* knew not the limitations of country, race or creed, and we need not be surprised if this Teutonic off-spring of his literary productiveness betrays some of the features of Iberian ancestry.

JOHN T. KRUMPELMANN.

*University of North Carolina.*

---

dass der Teufel, der die Glückseligkeit dieses guten Mannes (Guarins) beneidete, ein Einsiedler-Kleid anlegte und sich in eine Höle dieses Berges begab . . . hierauf nahm er Gelegenheit dem armen Guerin in den Weg zu gehen. . . . Guerin und der Teufel wurden sehr vertraut mit einander, und unterhielten sich oft von geistlichen Materien. Eine Zeitlang ging alles ziemlich gut. . . . Er (Guarin) zog seinen falschen Freund (den Teufel) zu Rath und eröffnete ihm wie mächtig seine unreine Leidenschaft geworden wäre, und er besonnen sey, die Gefahr zu fliehen; aber der Teufel rieth ihm, wieder in seine Zelle zu gehen und Gott zu beten, dass er ihn bewahren möchte. Guerin folgte diesem Rath, kehrte zurück und fiel in die unglückliche Schlinge. Hierauf beredete ihn der Teufel die Prinzessin zu töten um sein Verbrechen zu verbergen."

<sup>31</sup> *La Vida de Fr. Juan Garin*, Compuesto por Juan Pablo Font, no date, 820(?).

HEINE'S *DOPPELGÄNGER*

In Heine's *Die Heimkehr*, from the years 1823-1824, there is the well-known poem usually called *Der Doppelgänger*:

Still ist die Nacht, es ruhen die Gassen,  
In diesem Hause wohnte mein Schatz;  
Sie hat schon längst die Stadt verlassen,  
Doch steht noch das Haus auf demselben Platz.

Da steht auch ein Mensch und starrt in die Höhe,  
Und ringt die Hände vor Schmerzensgewalt;  
Mir graust es, wenn ich sein Antlitz sehe,—  
Der Mond zeigt mir meine eigne Gestalt.

Du Doppelgänger! du bleicher Geselle!  
Was äfst du nach mein Liebesleid,  
Das mich gequält an dieser Stelle,  
So manche Nacht in alter Zeit?

There is no doubt whatever that this poem—like most of the other verse contained in this collection—can be accounted for by the experiences which in these years were of outstanding importance to Heine as regards his feelings: his love for Amalia Heine. When he left Berlin for Lüneburg, in May 1823, the wound bled afresh on his return to the places where he had lost his love: “. . . in Hamburg, wohin ich bald nach der Hochzeit zu reisen gedenke, obschon durch den Anblick dieser Stadt die schmerzlichen Empfindungen in mir aufgeregt werden,” he writes to Varnhagen von Ense, in June 1823, from Lüneburg. It is clear that he had returned home only to be overcome by memories of old days of love: “Ich habe hier also bloss mit den Bäumen Bekanntschaft gemacht, und diese zeigen sich jetzt wieder in dem alten grünen Schmuck und mahnen mich an alte Tage, und rauschen mir alte vergessene Lieder ins Gedächtnis zurück, und stimmen mich zur Wehmut. So viel Schmerzliches taucht jetzt in mir auf und überwältigt mich, und dies ist es vielleicht was meine Kopfschmerzen vermehrt.” Thus runs a letter written to Moses Moser from the same place a day later.

The fact that a piece of real experience underlies this poem does not exclude an admixture of literary reminiscences. We ought to draw attention to the fact that Heine had just left Berlin where

he had lived very closely together with some of the most conspicuous writers of German romanticism. At Lutter & Wegner's he had mingled with E. T. A. Hoffmann's *coterie*, people like Ludwig Devrient and Dietrich Grabbe, and how much he was impressed just then by Hoffmann's personality and work we know both from the *Briefe aus Berlin*, 1822-23, and other papers of Heine's.

Under these circumstances, we cannot help attaching significance to the resemblance between a passage in *Kater Murr* and *Der Doppelgänger*. On one occasion Kreisler sees his second self when he looks down into the water and he speaks to him as follows: "Hoho, bist du da, geliebter Doppelgänger, wackerer Kumpan? . . . Mache mir nicht alle Gesten nach, Maler, wenn ich ernsthaft mit dir rede!—Schon wieder?" etc.

In his first *Brief aus Berlin*, Heine refers to Hoffmann as the "Kammergerichtsrat, der den Kater Murr geschrieben." A thorough acquaintance on the part of Heine with this novel can be postulated with a great amount of probability. And the scene in question really is one which is likely to remain in the memory. We need not relate the end of the passage in *Kater Murr* which may account for the part played by the moon in Heine's poem.

Lund.

S. B. LILJEGREN.

#### VILLON'S TESTAMENT, LINE 1194

In my review of Louis Thuasne's new edition of Villon (*Modern Language Notes*, xxxix, 430 ff.) I find myself guilty of an anachronism: on p. 433, I spoke of the "nuncio, who dwelt close at hand [that is, near the establishment of the Carmelites] at the Hotel de Cluny." The year in question is 1461, the date of the *Testament*. In fact, the Hotel de Cluny was not completed until 1490, and, further, there was no nuncio residing in Paris at that time (1461), although one had been promised as a sequel to the revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction in November of that year.<sup>1</sup> I should like to go a little farther in my suggestion as to the

<sup>1</sup> *Mémoires de Jacques du Clerq*, ed. Reiffenberg, 2d ed. (Brussels, 1835-36), I, ch. iv.

identity of the mysterious "Tusca" of *Testament* 1194. Since the adoption of the Pragmatic Sanction (July 7, 1438), the Papacy had but little influence in ecclesiastical appointments in France: the Pope's authority in all but points of doctrine had become virtually *nil*. But, by his letter of November 27, 1461, Louis XI abolished the Sanction and restored the administrative powers of the Holy See. This move was bitterly opposed by the University: a deputation was sent to protest to the King, who was at Tours. The University, in fact, had from the first been hostile to Pius II; even in the time of Calixtus III, they had nominated a committee to oversee the interpretation and execution of the Sanction.<sup>2</sup>

Now, François Villon, as is well known, was a child of the University: he shared her likes and dislikes, including her antipathy to the mendicant orders. As Pierre Champion says: "Dans ce milieu de Saint-Benoît, universitaire et décrétiste, Villon ne manqua pas d'adopter l'opinion des curés et des chanoines qu'il aurait pu entendre causer à la table de son prochain. Il a fait des Carmes, des Augustins . . . une satire des plus vives."<sup>3</sup> The Carmelites and the other mendicant friars were, of course, ardent enemies of the Sanction; they longed to be under the direct authority of Rome, and the Rector of the University, Guillaume Rivet, accused them of disturbing the peace of the University by working against the common law and the declarations of the Sanction.

It seems to have escaped observation that the Pope, Pius II, was a Sienese, and therefore a Tuscan: is he the "Tusca" of v. 1194? If we may read, as I proposed,

Que le Tuscā et ses gens d'armes (MS. de tusca)

we should restore one of Villon's pointed and scornful gibes: the ribald Friar Baude is assured that, the Pope's authority being now restored, thanks to the agitation of the friars, the Pope will proceed to keep him straight and deprive him of his mistress. Villon could hardly refer to the Pope by name, for obvious reasons, but many would understand the allusion to "the Tuscan." Moreover, it appears that the men-at-arms of the Tuscan Pope were at that

<sup>2</sup> Pastor, *History of the Popes*, edited by Frederick Ignatius Antonicus (London, 1900), III, pp. 129, 138, 141.

<sup>3</sup> *François Villon, sa Vie et son Temps*, I, p. 152.

moment very much in evidence: they were in expedition against Malatesta of Rimini. They were also engaged in active support of Ferrante of Naples against King René of Anjou, an opposition which struck fury into the hearts of Louis XI and his supporters, and even made Louis regret his concessions in the matter of the Sanction.<sup>4</sup> It is beyond doubt that the men-at-arms of "the Tuscan" might be a vivid allusion to Parisian Frenchmen of the year 1461.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

*University of North Carolina.*

---

## NOTES ON VOLTAIRE

I. The history of the destinies of Voltaire's *Le Fanatisme* or *Mahomet le Prophète*, given for the first time at Lille during the spring of 1741, and revived at the Comédie Française on August 9, 1742, where it was withdrawn after three performances, not to appear again until September 30, 1751, is unusually interesting.<sup>1</sup> From the time that Crébillon refused to approve the play, probably because of literary jealousy, to the date of its final triumph, its course was adroitly guided through various troubled waters by its resourceful author. It was characteristic of this age of trenchant criticism and violent polemics that *Mahomet* was greeted, soon after its appearance, by a series of brochures and parodies. Beuchot lists several which appeared at this time,<sup>2</sup> among them the *Lettre écrite à M. le Comte de . . . au sujet de la Tragédie de Mahomet*, 1742, in-12. This, a defense of *Mahomet*, was reprinted,

<sup>4</sup> Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 102, 119.

<sup>1</sup> It is surprising to note the many careless errors of date which occur in standard works; for example, in the Moland edition of *Oeuvres*, III, 94, 94, the date of the *première* at Paris is given as "29 août 1742." The Garnier, *Théâtre de Voltaire* overlooks the performance at Lille, saying "représentée pour la première fois le 9 août 1742" (p. 275). Deschanel in *Le Théâtre de Voltaire* (p. 172) gives the date of Voltaire's letter to Benedict XIV as August 7, 1745. In the *Voltaire ou Eloges Amplicouriques* (p. 161) the Pope's reply is dated Sept. 15, 1745.

<sup>2</sup> Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, III, 95.

together with *Les Sentiments d'un Spectateur sur la Tragédie de Mahomet* in Vol. XIV of *Les Amusements du Cœur et de l'Esprit*.<sup>3</sup> In this XVIIIth century periodical there is no attribution of authorship of *La Lettre écrite etc.*, nor is the date of its composition given. Beuchot does not solve either problem. However, in Manuscript 2757 of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, *Pièces de théâtre et autres oeuvres mêlées de Mr. l(abbé) A(unillon)*, this apology of *Mahomet* occurs, as well as other materials pertaining to Voltaire. Pierre Charles Fabio Aunillon, who was, according to the manuscript, "prêtre, docteur en droit de la Faculté de Paris, Abbé commendataire de l'Abbaye de Saint Laurent du Gué-de-Launay, pourvu en cour de Rome du Prieuré de Saint Onesime de Domchery," was an admirer of Voltaire, and, inasmuch as the *Lettre écrite* occurs among his manuscript works, it is doubtless by him. Moreover, statements such as the following: "De la façon dont le Mahomet de M. de Voltaire annonce ses principes et son propre caractère, je ne crois pas qu'il soit venu en tête à personne que le dessein de l'auteur ait été de lui procurer des prosélites" seem to indicate that the writer was a churchman.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore the following *Lettre de Mr. de Voltaire à l'auteur de la précédente* throws additional light on the problem:

Je reçois, Monsieur, en arrivant à Paris ce que je pouvais y trouver de plus flatteur, c'est la lettre dont vous avez bien voulu honorer *Mahomet*. Je ne peux plus à présent être fâché de rien, sinon de ce qu'on ne m'a pas envoyé cet ouvrage à Bruxelles, et de ce que ma pièce n'est pas assez digne de votre lettre, je crois en la lisant voir Hercules qui combat pour moi contre des Pygmées. Vous pensez bien, Monsieur, que mon premier

---

<sup>3</sup> *La Lettre écrite* is found on p. 424, *Les Sentiments* on p. 331.

<sup>4</sup> *Manuscript* 2757, Fol. 1-31. This letter chokes with the following *Envoi à Mr. de Voltaire*:

Non, ce n'est point pour te défendre  
 Contre les traits de tes rivaux jaloux,  
 Qu'en cet écrit ma voix se fait entendre.  
 Quand cet honneur eût été fait pour nous,  
 Quelle gloire aurais-je à prétendre,  
 A confondre des sots, des ignorants, des fous,  
 A venger *Mahomet* qu'un sot public décrie?  
 Connais par qui je me vis excité;  
 L'intérêt des beaux-arts, celui de ma patrie,  
 L'amour du vrai, peut-être aussi ma vanité.

devoir, et mon premier soin serait de venir dans l'instant vous remercier, vous embrasser. Si je n'étais accablé de tous les maux que je suis tenté de souhaiter aux fanatiques, dès que je pourrai sortir, je viendrai me jeter au côté de mon défenseur. Permettez, Mon. etc. à Paris ce dimanche 18, 9bre 1742.<sup>5</sup>

This "lettre dont vous avez bien voulu honorer *Mahomet*" is probably the *Lettre écrite à M. le comte de . . .* and the "docte dissertation" which Voltaire, in his letter of Oct., 1742, from Brussels to Aunillon in reply to the latter's letter "en style oriental,"<sup>6</sup> begs Aunillon "de bien vouloir faire mettre promptement au coche de Bruxelles." Now, as to the date of the brochure there seems to be little information. *Les Sentiments d'un Spectateur etc.*, is dated August, 1742, and it is possible that *La lettre écrite etc.*, which follows it closely in Vol. XIV of *Les Amusements du cœur et de l'esprit*, is of the same month. On the other hand Voltaire's letter to Aunillon from Brussels was not written until October, hence it seems likely that, had the brochure been written in August, Voltaire would have been informed of it before October.

II. The date of Voltaire's return to Paris late in 1742 from Brussels, where he had spent a few months (by no means a unique experience) with Madame du Châtelet, has been a bothersome problem for his biographers and bibliographers. Desnoiresterres states, obviously taking his information from Voltaire's letters to M. César de Missy, chaplain of the French church of St. James, London, of Nov. 7, 1742<sup>7</sup> and Nov. 10, 1742,<sup>8</sup> and the letter to M. le Comte d'Argental of November<sup>9</sup> that Voltaire announced his arrival "vers le 20 novembre," adding, "il y a pourtant de lui une lettre d'Arnaud du 20 nov. datée de Bruxelles."<sup>10</sup> A note in the Moland edition of Voltaire's *Oeuvres*,<sup>11</sup> "Voltaire rentra probablement à Paris vers la fin de décembre, 1742," indicates the editor's uncertainty as to the date of his arrival at Paris. Moreover, this incertitude led to confusion in the arrangement of the *Correspondance* of this period, for letter 1549<sup>12</sup> to M. César de

<sup>5</sup> Ms. 2757, Fol. 32. "la précédente" is, of course, *La lettre écrite, etc.*

<sup>6</sup> Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, XXXVI, 170.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem.*, p. 176.

<sup>8</sup> *Idem.*, p. 177.

<sup>9</sup> *Idem.*, p. 180.

<sup>10</sup> *Voltaire à Cirey*, p. 342.

<sup>11</sup> XXXVI, 155.

<sup>12</sup> *Idem.*, p. 179.



Missy, dated "ce samedi 24" precedes letter 1550 to M. le Comte d'Argental<sup>13</sup> dated "à Bruxelles, novembre," showing that the editor believed that Voltaire was at Brussels on Nov. 24, 1742. Now, Voltaire's letter of Dec. 3, 1742, in which he rebukes de Missy for not answering his communications "de Bruxelles" and "de Paris" obviously refers to nos. 1546 and 1549 respectively, and accordingly he was at Paris on Nov. 24. It should be noted that the manuscript letter quoted above is dated "à Paris, ce dimanche 18 9bre 1742."<sup>14</sup> In view of these facts it is evident that Voltaire arrived at Paris on or about November 18, and that the letters in the Moland edition are not in their right order. Letter 1548 to Baculard d'Arnaud is either of another year or was sent from Paris.

III. Voltaire had ample grounds for his animosity toward the "officers" of the Régiment de la Calotte, that bizarre company, into which, during the first half of the eighteenth century, were inducted all those "nobles ou roturiers, qui se distinguent par quelque folie marquée ou quelque trait ridicule."<sup>15</sup> During the early years of his poetic career he was a victim of the various fabricators of *Calottes*, or *Brevets*, which he defined as "une plaisanterie ignoble, toujours répétée, toujours retombant dans les mêmes tours, sans esprit, sans imagination, sans grâce."<sup>16</sup> Hen-net, in his *Le Régiment de la Calotte*,<sup>17</sup> considers Voltaire's relationships with the famous regiment, discussing the *Brevets* written against him by Roy and Camusat. A *Calotte* which seems to have been overlooked by Hennes and other writers is the *Calotte d'Arrouet* from the caustic pen of the rhyming abbot Gacon, le Poète sans fard, who barked at Voltaire on frequent occasions, and who was unusually prolific in the composition of *Brevets de la Calotte*. It occurs among the unpublished verse of Gacon in ms. 751 of the library of Lyons.

<sup>13</sup> *Idem.*, p. 180.

<sup>14</sup> Nov. 18, 1742, fell on Sunday. Cf. Cappelli: *Cronologica e Calendario Perpetuo*, Milan, 1906, p. 120.

<sup>15</sup> "Régiment de la Calotte," *Théâtre de la Foire*. Lesage et d'Orneval, v, 1.

<sup>16</sup> Mémoires sur la Satire," *Œuvres*, xxiii.

<sup>17</sup> Paris, 1886, p. 19 ff.

De par le Dieu porte Marotte,  
 Nous, généraux de la Calotte,  
 Torsac, Aimon, et St. Martin,  
 Tenant le conseil Calotin,  
 Attendu qu'aux âmes bien nées  
 La vertu previent les années,  
 Nous recevons le jeune Harrouet,\*  
 Dans l'âge encore propre au fouet,  
 Chef et Brigadier des poètes,  
 Que par grâce et faveur secrètes  
 Le ciel au sortir du berceau  
 Rend digne du sacré coteau.  
 Témoin le poème d'*Oedipe*,  
 Où sans étude et sans principe,  
 Même avant l'âge de vingt ans  
 Il étala tant de bon sens  
 Que la foule, criant merveille,  
 Le mit au-dessus de Corneille.  
 Ce qui, donnant un juste orgueil  
 Au dit Harrouet, dans sa préface  
 Il fit voir au droit comme à l'œil  
 Les défauts des Rois du Parnasse;  
 Prouva que Sophocle est grossier,  
 Et que Corneille, qu'on estime  
 Pour la pensée et pour la rime,  
 N'était pas un fort grand sorcier.  
 Il est vrai que son *Artémire*,  
 Quoique pleine d'excellents traits  
 Et très digne que l'on admire  
 N'a pu triompher des sifflets,  
 Mais la faute en est au parterre,  
 Qui, jugeant de tout au hasard,  
 Déclare très souvent la guerre  
 Aux plus grandes beautés de l'art.

Au surplus ce rimeur prodigue  
 En chefs-d'œuvre toujours divers,  
 Par un poème sur la ligue  
 Va surprendre tout l'univers.  
 D'autant plus qu'Homère et Virgile  
 Pour la pensée et pour le style,  
 En approcheront aussi peu  
 Que le savoyard de l'hébreu.  
 —Je chante un roi, nous dit Vol-  
   taire,  
 —De ses sujets vainqueur et père  
 —Et qui plein d'un cœur généreux  
 —Força les Français d'être heureux.  
 Début sans doute magnifique  
 Et dont l'auguste majesté  
 Fait nargue à la simplicité,  
 Qu'Horace dans sa *Poétique*  
 Exige de ceux dont la voix  
 Entrepren de chanter les rois  
 Par des poèmes héroïques:  
 Mais toutes ces vieilles pratiques  
 Et ces préceptes ne sont bons  
 Que pour des esprits peu féconds.  
 A ces causes, sûrs que l'haleine  
 Ne lui fera jamais faux bond,  
 Quelque haut qu'il ait pris son ton,  
 Lui donnons pour prix de sa veine  
 Nos honneurs en plein, et pour  
   droits,  
 Lui déléguons cent francs par mois  
 Sur tous les baillements que cause  
 Poème qu'écolier compose,  
 Et dont le puéril effort  
 Fatigue un lecteur et l'endort.

GEORGE B. WATTS.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

\* Grouet.

## A SECOND PSEUDONYM OF CECILIA BÖHL DE ARROM

Both Luis Coloma<sup>1</sup> and Diego de Valencina<sup>2</sup> felt it necessary to explain with some detail why and how Cecilia Böhl de Arrom chose the pseudonym of *Fernán Caballero*. Yet in presenting the explanation—each in a version at variance with that of the other—both overlooked the equally significant fact which, curiously enough, has hitherto escaped the attention of all who have written concerning the novelist, that upon one occasion, at least, she signed her work with a *nom de plume* other than that with which her name is generally associated.

The circumstances occasioning this grew out of the oft-quoted critical articles which Eugenio de Ochoa published on August 26 (No. 422) and September 18, 1849 (No. 441), in the Madrid daily *La España*, praising in most enthusiastic terms the novel *La Gaviota*, after its thirty-four instalments had run their course in the feuilleton columns of another Madrid newspaper, *El Heraldo*, from May 9 to July 14, 1849 (Nos. 2136-2192). These articles at once established Doña Cecilia's literary prestige; and she was among the first to realize their significance to her. Naturally, she felt deeply grateful to Ochoa and sought to show him her appreciation by forwarding one of her shorter tales<sup>3</sup> to *La España*, with which her "Maecenas" was associated. Its publication<sup>4</sup> must have brought her a reproof from the editorial staff of *El Heraldo*, for, in order to remain upon a friendly footing with both newspapers, she resorted to the subterfuge of concealing her identity by means of a new pseudonym the next time she had a contribution for *La España*. This must have been some time before May 23, 1850,<sup>5</sup> for on this date the following announcement headed its feuilleton section:

<sup>1</sup> *Recuerdos de Fernán Caballero*, Bilbao, [1910], pp. 313-315.

<sup>2</sup> *Cartas de Fernán Caballero*, Madrid, 1919, p. 374, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> This was *Élia, o la España 30 Años Ha*, first announced in *La España* Wednesday, October 17, 1849 (No. 466).

<sup>4</sup> It is impossible to ascertain the exact dates of its publication from the files of *La España* in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, since the numbers between November 25, 1849, and January 1, 1850, are missing. The novel was promised five more times after the date given in the preceding note, the last time being on November 24, 1849 (No. 499).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *La España*, No. 651.

En la semana próxima empezaremos a publicar sin interrupción (terminada que sea la novela SECRETOS DE UN CEMENTERIO, que estamos dando), una preciosa novelita original, de costumbres contemporáneas, cuyo manuscrito tenemos completo en nuestro poder, firmado con el nombre hoy desconocido en la república literaria de *León de Lara*. Su título es CALLAR EN VIDA Y PERDONAR EN MUERTE.

The editors of *La España* apparently wished to make capital from this advance notice, for it was repeated on May 24 (No. 652), May 26 (No. 654), May 29 (No. 656), and June 1, 1850 (No. 657). Finally, on June 5, 1850, there appeared the first instalment; and the whole story was contained in the three issues of June 5 to June 7, 1850 (Nos. 661-663).

The following paragraph of a letter<sup>6</sup> written by Doña Cecilia to Ochoa some time after June 7, 1850,<sup>7</sup> upon learning that he was the author of the *Carta del Lector de las Batuecas a Fernán Caballero*, which had appeared in *El Heraldo* of June 2, 1850 (No. 2462), not only contains her confession of her identity with *León de Lara*, but also shows that she realized that her stratagem had been a failure:

Celebro haya gustado a usted la novelita (pondremos diminutiva al diminutivo primitivo). Lo gracioso fué que antier recibí el primer número y en el mismo correo una carta de Mora, diciéndome: "He leído la preciosa novelita de usted que *La España*, etc.," con su correspondiente quejita. Le he contestado negando a pie juntilla, y suplicándole sepa por usted y me escriba quién es ese León que me imita o parodia. ¡Conocerme por el primer número! Si hubiese sido por el final, por el que, al entender de mi lector de las Batuecas, flaquean, ¡anda con Dios!

Still more conclusive evidence proving the identity of *Fernán Caballero* and *León de Lara* is the fact that six years later, in 1856,

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Valencina, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-30 for the rough draft of this letter. The paragraph here reproduced is given on page 27.

<sup>7</sup> The opening sentence of the rough draft of the letter mentioned in the preceding note is: "¡Difícil me sería pintar a usted mi sorpresa al recibir hoy su favorecida del 7 de éste y ver que era usted mi lector de las Batuecas!" and the second paragraph runs: "...tuve el atrevimiento de contestar creyendo que era otro. ¡Cuánto me pesa! Suplico a usted que diga a Mora no lo imprima. . ." As the article referred to appeared on June 2, 1850, and Fernán's reply, entitled *Respuesta de Fernán Caballero a su Lector de las Batuecas*, was printed, in spite of her request, in the issue of June 21, 1850 (No. 2478), of *El Heraldo*, the "éste" of the sentence quoted can refer only to June.

this same story, *Callar en vida y perdonar en muerte*, together with *La Familia de Alvarada*, formed the third volume of the Mellado edition of the collected works of *Fernán Caballero*.<sup>8</sup> From that date to this the story has found a regular place in the many editions of her works, but it has never been accompanied by any mention of the fact that its author was first announced as *León de Lara*.

E. HERMAN HESPELT.

*Elmira College.*

### A NEW WORD AND A NEW MEANING

In a letter to his friend Mason the poet Gray says—I quote the relevant part only:

“Come hither yourself, for our copuses and Welsh rabbits are impatient for you.”

The quotation is from Tovey's *Letters of Gray*, III, 69, and also Draper's recent study of *William Mason*. In neither place, or in any other that I have found, is the word *copuses* explained or assumed to be a mis-writing of some well known term. It does not occur in our dictionaries big or little, even though it seems to be an English, or Anglicized word by its plural in *-es*. Assuming that *copus* might be Latin it can not be found in any Latin dictionary except Ducange. There, at least, is *copus*, first, as Ducange says, for *copponus* ‘mensura frumentaria’; second *copus vini* defined as ‘un coup de vin,’ with the following quotation:

Consuetud. Festorum Monasterii Solemnias. mss.: In Dominica Septuag. . . . ad cenam farinam coctam adipe et copos de vino puro. Ibidem: Et ad cenam cops de vino puro.

The first meaning would not be inappropriate to Gray's sentence, and it would be quite like him to mingle medieval Latin with English in his description of the inviting repast. The second definition, however, is more likely to supply the sense of the passage,

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ferdinand Wolf, *Ueber den realistischen Roman und das Sittenbild bei den Spaniern in der neuesten Zeit, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die Werke von Fernan Caballero* (in *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, Berlin, 1 [1859], 262, n. 1).

unless we have here a misprint or mis-reading. In any case should we not have a note of explanation, or a recognition of a new word which ought to be in our dictionaries for the assistance of other puzzled readers?

The new meaning to which I would call attention is that of the word *berm*, as used recently in my presence by a construction engineer and apparently well established in parts of America. I may premise that the word *berm* has already been given three meanings in our dictionaries. The *Cent. Dict.*, which here betters the *NED.*, defines as,

1. A narrow ledge; specifically, in *fort.*, a space of ground or a terrace from 3 to 5 feet in width, left between the rampart and the moat or foss, designed to receive the ruins of the rampart in the event of a bombardment, and to prevent the earth from filling the foss. . . .

2. The bank or side of a canal which is opposite the towing path. . . .

The first definition is better than that of the *NED.*, in that it gives the reason for making the berm, a reason which the *NED.* might better have taken from Bailey's *Dictionary* of 1727 or from Johnson. The *Supplement* to the *Cent. Dict.* (1909) gives a third meaning to the term:

3. In *railroad engin.*, the narrow horizontal plane between the foot of the embankment or excavation slope and the top of the slope of the side bank.

The *New International* published in the same year as the *Supplement* above generalized these definitions in the following way, and with what seems to me corresponding lack of clearness:

A narrow, approximately level shelf, path or edge, as at the bottom or top of a slope, or along a bank; a bench; specif., *Fort.*, such a ledge between the foot of a parapet and the top of the scarp. See *Fortification*, *Illust.*

The next year, 1910, the *Encyc. Brit.* gave another generalization, which should have been indicated as a new and fourth meaning. It defines the word as,

A narrow ledge of ground, generally the level banks of a river. It gives, moreover, an admirable example of the new use from Sir Wm. Garstin's *Report on the Upper Nile* (1904):

In most places there is a well-defined alluvial berm of recent formation and varying width, up to perhaps a couple of kilometres.

The new meaning, which seems to be common in Northern Ohio at least, may be explained as follows:

In highway construction the ledge or level ground at the side of the road, from the top of the ditch to the boundary of the highway.

For example a legal highway of 60 feet in width would have a roadway proper of perhaps 30 feet, including the ditch for drainage at each side, and a *berm* on each side of 15 feet. According to the same engineer, the same term is applied to the ledge at the side of a city street, on which is usually a sidewalk and often a strip of sod between the sidewalk and the curb. In any case this use of *berm* is as specific as any so far recorded, is apparently of American origin, and is coming into more widely extended use in modern road-making. The word *berm* does not occur in the English *Dial. Dict.*, or in any collection of Americanisms, so far as I have found, except Thornton's *Glossary*, which records *berm* in the second of the *Cent. Dict.*'s meanings, with a newspaper quotation from Pennsylvania.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

### MORE LIGHT ON SPENSER'S LINGUISTICS

By way of appendix to my earlier paper on Spenser's linguistics in his Irish pamphlet,<sup>1</sup> the following notes might well be added. Spenser's curious etymology of *tanistry*, the custom of choosing a tribal chief, was perhaps suggested by Camden, with whose work Spenser was undoubtedly familiar.<sup>2</sup> Camden divides the word

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Phil.*, xvii, 111 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Spenser's historical sources and his treatment of them have received considerable attention, e. g., C. G. Osgood in *Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, xxiii, 65 *et seq.*; Miss C. A. Harper, *Spenser's British Chronical History*, Philadelphia, 1910; and J. W. Draper in *Mod. Phil.*, xvii, 1 *et seq.* Spenser's knowledge of Camden is, furthermore, amply attested by the references to him in the *Ruins of Time*, 169 and 174.

*Britannia* into the aboriginal proper noun *Brith-* and the supposedly Greek *-tania*, "country." To support this theory, he cites *Mauritania*, *Lusitania*, *Aquitania*; and he explains the use of *-tania* among the Celts as a borrowing from Greek traders.<sup>3</sup> Spenser, doubtless cognizant of these statements in Camden, associated *tanistry* with the group of proper names mentioned by the historian; but apparently because the word seemed to him essentially Celtic, he appears to have discarded Camden's theory of a Greek origin, and to have substituted in place of it the opinion that it is a word immemorially belonging to the "barbarous" peoples of western Europe.

The curious etymology of *Scot* from the Greek work for darkness or obscurity, may well have come from Holinshed, who declares: "They [the Scotch] were also called *Scoti* by the Romans, because their Iland and original inhabitation thereof were unknowne, and they themselves an obscure nation in the sight of all the world."<sup>4</sup> Camden also refers to this etymology.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, far-fetched classical etymologies, as the earlier pages of Camden attest, were commonly accepted even by the most critical Elizabethans; and the fact that Spenser seems to use this etymology to make a rather strained pun at the expense of Stanyhurst, whose Egyptian theory<sup>6</sup> he was attacking, does not, I think, disprove his belief in the derivation of *Scot* from the Greek.<sup>7</sup>

JOHN W. DRAPER.

*The University of Maine.*

<sup>3</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, London, 1789, xx et seq.

<sup>4</sup> *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 1807, I, 10.

<sup>5</sup> Camden, whose inclination toward the Scotch (perhaps on account of the Cumberland ancestry of his mother) has elsewhere been noted (see *D. N. B.*), rejects this etymology as "the invention of malevolence to insult a renowned and gallant people."

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Holinshed*, ed. cit., V, 33.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. F. F. Covington, Jr., in *St. in Phil.*, XIX, 247, who is of the opinion that the Greek etymology is "too fanciful" for Spenser to have believed and that the poet is merely "trying to make a joke." It seems to me that the other etymologies both of Spenser and of "E. K." show no lack of credulity, and that both Camden and Holinshed treat this particular derivation quite seriously.



## THE AUTHOR OF TWO BYRON APOCRYPHA

Two of the more important Byron apocrypha are *Lord Byron's Farewell to England* and *Lord Byron's Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*. The first was published in 1816 in pamphlet form by J. Johnston (London) and "obtained a wide circulation,"<sup>1</sup> appearing in a number of collections piratically issued. The *Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*, likewise published by Johnston, was suppressed by injunction proceedings begun by Murray in November, 1816; and was re-issued in 1817 with a change in the offending title. Neither Chew<sup>2</sup> nor Kölbing<sup>3</sup> was able to find an author for these pieces.

Recently, while searching the files of the *Analectic Magazine* (published in Philadelphia at the opening of the last century) for quite another purpose, I found what seems to be sufficient ground for assigning these pieces to their originator. In volume XIII of the *Analectic*, the May (1819) number, there appears, pp. 360-367, a review of

*The Ocean Harp: a Poem, in two Cantos, with some smaller pieces; and a Monody on the Death of John Syng Dorsey, M. D. By the author of 'Lord Byron's Farewell to England,' 'Pilgrimage to the Holy Land,' and other pieces. Philad. 1819.*

The review begins:

The writer of these Poems, it appears from the publisher's advertisement, is a Mr. Agg; and we moreover gather from the preface, that he is one of the many Englishmen, who are induced by the suffering and oppressed condition of their own country, to seek a residence in ours. . . . His claims upon our hospitality as a stranger, voluntarily seeking an abode among us, are, therefore, attended by an equally unquestionable right to our courtesy and respect, as a poet of no despicable fame."

The reviewer, who had published an article examining "The Pilgrimage to the Holy Land" in the *Analectic* for May, 1811 (vol. x, pp. 397-400), had been acute enough to see that the poem was not Byron's, and is familiar with the facts concerning Murray injunction proceedings against Johnston. He takes up considerable space trouncing "Agg," first for fathering his poems on Byron, &

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Chew, *Byron in England*, p. 170 note.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 170-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Englische Studien*, xxvi, p. 76.

second, for attempting in his "preliminary advertisement" to the *Ocean Harp* to stigmatize Rogers "with the commission of the same sort of artifice."<sup>4</sup>

The last half of the article is devoted to a critique of *The Ocean Harp*, a poem of 3,000 lines, thoroughly Byronic in style, and apparently written to ingratiate the author with the American public.<sup>5</sup> Canto one "contains the reflections of an emigrant from England while on board the ship which brings him away"; canto two is a "long eulogy on our national institutions and national character." From the extracts given it is evident that "Mr. Agg" is a clever imitator of Byron.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that the "publisher's advertisement" is correct and that Agg wrote the *Farewell to England*, the *Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*, and *The Ocean Harp*. But who was "Mr. Agg"? The name is sufficiently unusual so that the chances that there were two clever Englishmen writing Byronic poetry in eastern America in the twenties are so small as to be ignored. He seems, moreover, judging from the review, to have achieved a certain name. I find, upon search, that John T. Agg,<sup>6</sup> "sometime editor of the *National Journal*," an Englishman "of ability" was at Washington in the twenties, and that in 1824, on the occasion of Mrs. Adams's ball in honour of General Jackson, he wrote "a set of verses" which "have been . . . often quoted." The verses are given in Wharton, and are of the same generally facile quality of the other Agg poems.

I may add that in 1821 John Agg and Elizabeth G. (Blackford) Agg sold land in Newark, N. J., for a consideration of \$500.<sup>7</sup> This may be the poet, but it seems to point rather to an American branch of the family, the presence of which in New Jersey or Philadelphia was presumably an inducement for a clever journalist and verse-maker to migrate to the new world where he might make

<sup>4</sup> Agg alleged that Rogers, by permitting his *Jacqueline* to appear anonymously in the same volume with Byron's *Lara*, had attempted by his ruse to make people believe that Byron had written both poems.

<sup>5</sup> *The Ocean Harp* apparently escaped Professor Leonard in his *Byron Byronism in America*.

<sup>6</sup> Wharton, *Social Life in the Early Republic*, pp. 213-4; 230.

<sup>7</sup> *New Jersey Historical Society Proceedings*, Second Series, vol. 13,

Jan. 1863.

a reputation. The two Byron apocrypha we may, I think, confidently ascribe to John T. Agg.

Mr. Chew says in his bibliography (heading, *Analectic Magazine*) that he has not found the original of "what seems to be one of the earliest sketches of Byron's life," an article "reprinted from this magazine in Byron's Poetical Works, Boston: Cummings and Hilliard, 1814." This article, entitled simply, "Lord Byron" is in the *Analectic* for July, 1814, vol. iv, pp. 68-72.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES.

*University of North Carolina.*

## REVIEWS

---

*Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England*, by ELIZABETH WHEELER MANWARING. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925, pp. 243. \$3.00.

This is an excellent book, and one that admirably illustrates how much the study of one art may contribute to knowledge of the others and to the general understanding of a period. The subject, which has hitherto received almost no attention from students of literature, proves very rewarding for the light it throws not only on the influence of Italian painting but on the taste of the period, the virtuoso movement (which was closely identified with literature), the rise of landscape gardening, the interest in ruins and wild nature, and on the use of such words as "romantic," "picturesque," "taste," "connoisseur."

Miss Manwaring's thesis, which she proves beyond a doubt, is that it was largely through the paintings of Claude Lorrain, Salvator Rosa, and, to a less degree, of the Poussins that the English came to admire scenery, that they looked at landscapes as if they were pictures and so described them both in prose and verse, and even laid out their parks so as to afford views like those in the much-prized Italian paintings. She first studies the English interest in scenery and in painting at the opening of the eighteenth century, and shows that there was some real feeling for the former but almost no taste for the latter. Next she traces the growing enthusiasm for Salvator and Claude under the stimulus of foreign travel, the formation of great English collections, and the popularity of engravings and etchings of their works. She then sketches the influence of their painting on the poetry and the landscape gardening of the period, discusses "The Cult of the Picturesque" with particular reference to the novel, and concludes with an unsatisfactory treatment of "Italian Landscape and Romanticism." In this last chapter she tells us that the prints of the time "were of a world removed noticeably from the world of reality . . . a world almost as fanciful as that of the *Arcadia* or *Otranto*," but this assertion needs considerable modification since it does not even hold true of all the prints she reproduces. The index is perfunctory but the book contains relatively few mistakes, the worst being the repeated misspelling of John Scott's "Amwell."

The omissions are more serious. The treatment of the influence of Italian painting on poetry is little more than a preliminary sketch since only twelve pages are given to writers after Thomson. It would be interesting to know whether Grahame,

Hurdis, Gisborne, and many other landscape poets who are not mentioned show this influence. Since a good deal is said about prints one wishes there had been some discussion of the influence of Piranesi's very numerous engravings with their romantic treatment of classical ruins. "Peter Pindar's" *Odes to the Royal Academicians* might also have been used. Of course Miss Manwaring could not cover everything, but it is to be hoped that she will later use on some of these subjects the acumen, the originality and the pleasant style she shows in this book. Possibly she may give us what we greatly need, an accurate account of English purchases of notable foreign paintings and furniture, paralleling Michaelis's *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* and Poulsen's more recent *Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses*.

In her anxiety to avoid the ostentatious pedantry of overdocumentation Miss Manwaring has had little regard for the scholar who wishes to pursue the subject further. She quotes from many works,—novels, books of travel, and long poems,—without giving page or line references and at times fails even to name titles. To one citation she adds the comprehensive foot-note "Boswelliana." Recent scholarly publications she rarely mentions. Draper's *William Mason* presumably appeared too late to be used but this reason cannot be urged for omitting W. G. Howard's learned and valuable *Ut Pictura Poesis* (*P. M. L. A.*, xxiv, 40-123) where she would have learned that the exaltation of historical above all other kinds of painting goes back at least to Alberti (1436). It is hard to say how much use she has made of the work of any of her predecessors. Alicia Amhurst's (Mrs. E. Cecil's) *History of Gardening in England* with its extensive bibliography appears only as the source of a quotation. Nor is it clear whether there has been any systematic examination of that great storehouse of information as to all aspects of the eighteenth century, the magazines.

The book is attractively printed and bound (though the paper will not take ink) and, in the eighteenth-century phrase, is "adorned with sculptures," that is, with twenty-five full-page illustrations chiefly from engravings after Claude, Salvator, and their followers. It thus reflects credit on the publishers as well as on the author, the Yale Graduate School, and the Wellesley Semi-Centennial Series to which it belongs.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Political Novel: Its Development in England and in America.*

By MORRIS EDMUND SPEARE. New York: Oxford University Press, 1924. Pp. 377.

It is a delight in this day and generation to find such appreciation of Disraeli's novels as one does in *The Political Novel*, by Dr. Morris Edmund Speare, of the University of Maryland. For all too few people nowadays know Disraeli the novelist. The fault is not entirely theirs; he himself is much to blame. There is not one of his works but is marred by such unevenness that Disraeli at his worst sinks pretty low. Yet on any page of them you may come suddenly on brilliant aphorism, lofty poetic imagination, accurate and sympathetic knowledge of human nature, striking verisimilitude, and serious and sincere purpose. To all these high qualities of Disraeli Dr. Speare does full justice, though it is the last with which he is particularly concerned; for it was seriousness of purpose which produced Disraeli's political novels—which made him in fact the founder, as he is still the great exemplar, of this kind of writing in English.

Dr. Speare defines a political novel as one which deals rather with 'ideas' than 'emotions,' with the machinery of law-making or with a theory about public conduct rather than with the merits of any given piece of legislation, and which has for its main purpose party propaganda, public reform, or exposition of the lives of the personages who maintain government, or of the forces which constitute government. His first chapter considers the chief characteristics of the political novel, which 'was born in the prismatic mind of Benjamin Disraeli.' Then follow five chapters devoted to Disraeli's fiction. After these are chapters discussing the political novels of Trollope, George Eliot, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Mr. H. G. Wells, and in America of Henry Adams, Mr. Winston Churchill, and Paul Leicester Ford. With these Dr. Speare completes his number of memorable writers of the political novel in English.

Because of Disraeli's great importance in this field, Dr. Speare is right in devoting to him half the space of his book—at least in view of the limits which he has set to the treatment of his subject. But he might have broadened his treatment. Ever since the lively parliamentary election in Smollett's *Sir Launcelot Greaves*, fictitious politics had appeared in the novel from time to time. Moral purpose had appeared in it in the works of its founders, Richardson and Fielding, and this, as Dr. Speare notes briefly, had been directed towards definite reform in the works of William Godwin and his contemporaries. It was only a question of time when political material instead of being invented by the novelist simply to adorn his tale should be borrowed from vital contemporary questions and shaped to definite propaganda. A chapter would

have been interesting that traced the steps by which this result was finally reached in four or five novels of Disraeli. And a distinction might have been made between the authors who subsequently continued to use fictitious politics, like Trollope, and those who incorporated actual political questions in their novels. Indeed of the writers considered, Trollope is the only one who invented his political issues. If his novels are to be discussed, why not also Mark Twain's and Charles Dudley Warner's *Gilded Age*? One of its purposes was to show certain evils in American political life, its pictures of which come close to actual conditions. There are other novels, too, which, though less nearly related to the subject than those named, might have received notice in the book.

Dr. Speare writes chiefly, however, to show the importance of the political novel in England and America since Disraeli created it and raised it to the high place which it has ever since kept. This he has done clearly, and with good critical comment, especially in his appreciation of Disraeli already noted. Of course not every one will agree with all his judgments of the works he discusses, but none will find them fantastic, and the majority will find them sound. All will find his book interesting, and valuable in its information—a very helpful book to students of the novel.

GUSTAVUS HOWARD MAYNADIER.

*Harvard University.*

*German Lyrics and Ballads, from Klopstock to Modern Times.*

Edited by BERT J. VOS and PRESTON A. BARBA. Holt & Co., New York, 1925. xviii + 526 pp.

A book gotten up "with pleasure and a sense of exaltation," containing poems that are "beautiful, characteristic or vital," and aiming, above all, "to elicit a response from the reader to the appeal of aesthetic values." For their excellent success in gaining these ends we owe hearty thanks to the editors. This rich collection of 356 pages of verse is dignified in form, and distinguished in character.

About 60 pages are given to such representative moderns as <sup>Walt</sup> Whitman, Holz, Schaukal, Rilke, and Werfel. The necessarily condensed biographies and characterizations of authors are models of significance and pertinency. A faithful reproduction of Kraus's portrait of Goethe (1776) makes the frontispiece.

The only printers' slips worth noting are the substitution of *Tarum* for *Traum* on p. 258, l. 8, and *Die* for *Hie*, p. 426, l. 13. In a work which shows the most pious respect for the text and even the typographic form of each selection, it is to be regretted

that the Grecian stanzas of Hölderlin and other poets are set in a shape so unlike that to which we are accustomed in editions of the ancient classics.

It would be hard to point out how a more representative set of selections could have been chosen. Only three omissions seem to call for a tribute of regret: Klopstock's *An Fanny*, Goethe's *Natur und Kunst*, and Heine's *Aus alten Märchen*—for reasons which will doubtless occur to most students of German literature. For these, we could well have spared Schiller's stilted *Hektors Abschied* (even his rather rowdy *An die Freude* seems preferable to this), and some of the examples from Eichendorff and Schwab—not to mention Fontane's *John Maynard*. The notes suggest that this ballad may derive from none other than that cherished comrade of our boyish hours, the unapproached Horatio Alger, Jr., creator of *From Farm-Boy to Senator*, *Tattered Tom*, and *Bound to Rise*. This editorial theory one is quite inclined to accept. One misses an index of first lines and titles, were it only in condensed print.

The notes reveal the mature charm of a wide, well-assimilated literary knowledge, which delightfully enriches the text to the cultured reader. We do not especially quarrel with such comments as "a most melodious poem"; "a fine line"—addressed to students who will make use of the book. Heaven knows, many of them need such sign-posts! Line 229 of Bürger's *Lenore*, so utterly misunderstood by Walter Scott and many less gifted translators, seems to beg for an illuminating note. While "*purpur*" might be a good rendering for *scharlach* (p. 371), the English "purple" is less felicitous. Goethe's *Fischer* is said, very tersely, to employ "a seven-line stanza," without any hint as to the long and honorable history of this particular form.

Our editors fall into the ancient, pussy-footing procession of Goethe-idolaters in allowing that the *Élégies* "perhaps may" reflect his life in Rome, but are rather to be interpreted as coming from "the poet's union with Christiane." In common justice to that admired much and much reproved life-partner, let us have the charity to hope that the *Zwei gefährliche Schlangen*, at least, should be exempt from such a construction. The Fragments of a Great Confession ought to be explained with a reasonable degree of common-sense.

The Remarks on Versification are adapted to the humil-  
telligence, and observe a discreet avoidance of the broad Bols.  
of the Modern Language Association's committee on M.  
Notation. The so-called "pentameter" (p. 364) might well  
called an hexameter filled out by rests, rather than a "truncated"  
one. While the present writer has any being, he will firmly refuse  
to accept a trochee in place of a spondee in the epic line. Quanti-  
tative values must be assumed (or forced), unless students are to



miss a true sense of "the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man." This is a hard saying, and few there be that can bear it—but in lieu of argument, let our notice close by quoting, from this most worthy and gratifying collection, the two lines of Platen (p. 177):

Wer sich zu dichten erkühnt und die Sprache verschmäht und den  
Rhythmus,  
Gliche dem Plastiker, der Bilder gehaun in die Luft!

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

*Northwestern University.*

---

*A Historical and Bibliographical Survey of the German Religious Drama.* By MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN. University of Pittsburgh Studies in Language and Literature, 1924. xxiii + 286 pp.

Practically speaking, this is a purely bibliographical work, as the historical survey is limited to an Introduction of about five pages. The arrangement of the bibliographical material is good. It is given first under the two large divisions of the Middle Ages and the period from the Reformation on, and under each of these is further classified, including bibliographies of the individual plays. Then, for convenient reference, all the works, except those in the English language on the contemporary passion plays, are given again in an alphabetical list.

The work has its errors, as bibliographies practically always have; it has some omissions, some wrong statements, and, in my opinion, some errors of judgment. It is surely an error of judgment to give such a haphazard assortment of reviews, neither attempting completeness nor trying to select discriminatingly. It is also, it seems to me, a mistake to include a complete bibliography of the Oberammergau passion play, taking up twenty-seven pages in the classified part alone. There are few subjects about which so much of purely ephemeral interest and of absolutely no scholarly value has been written. In the historical survey (p. xiii) is a statement that of all the church holidays the three great ones, Easter, Christmas and Ascension, were the first to have their plays. But there are no known facts that justify the inclusion of Ascension in this statement. Professor Rudwin lists, to be sure, one Ascension play as early as the thirteenth century (p. 51), but that is an error, the play in question being an Easter play, a Latin *Visitatio sepulchri*. The statements under Munich Corpus Christi plays (p. 84) are inaccurate in that they speak of a German text

in verse. These Munich processions were not plays and had no text. The so-called text referred to is a description in verse. Without any attempt to check up the completeness of the bibliographical material, I noticed a few omissions, of which I shall mention only one: in the admirable *Bibliographie der schweizerischen Landeskunde*, published by the Zentralkommission für schweizerische Landeskunde, there is, in Heft IV, pp. 107-116, a bibliography of the Swiss religious drama with about 120 titles, most of them for German Switzerland; this is omitted in Professor Rudwin's work, and some of its titles that should be included are not to be found there.

While the pointing out of errors is one of the functions of a review, another is that of passing a broad judgment upon the work. In this case it should be said that the errors do not seriously impair the value of the work. This is the first really useful bibliography of the German religious drama, and I am sure that all who are interested in this field are grateful to Professor Rudwin for compiling and publishing it.

NEIL C. BROOKS.

*University of Illinois.*

---

*Mélanges de Philologie, offerts à M. Johan Vising par ses élèves et ses amis scandinaves, à l'occasion du soixante-dixième anniversaire de sa naissance.* Göteborg, N. J. Gumperts; Paris, E. Champion, 1925. xii + 419 pp.

This handsome volume is assuredly one of the best of recent *Festschriften*. It is unfortunate that only 250 copies have been issued. Admirers of Vising will be pleased by the excellent photograph as frontispiece and the complete bibliography of his writings, compiled by J. Borsgård. Of the thirty-one articles but four are devoted to French literature: *Romanisches in der ältesten islandischen Literatur* (Beckman), *Une vieille chanson française* (Löseth), *Guerres de Pont-Sainte-Maxence et la légende de Becket* (Waldberg), and a Swedish metrical translation from the first branch of the *Roman de Renard*, the Hen's death and burial and the diplomatic mission of Bruin to Renard (G. Tilander). Beckman draws attention to the acquaintance with French, in Iceland, during the XIIth century. Rikinne, a French minstrel, was resident there before 1121. The *chanson* published by Löseth is a lady's lament for her absent lover (c. 1500), twenty-six lines in length and composed in Flanders. It is preserved in the National Archives of Oslo and is of little interest. Waldberg has answered the patronizing and excessively severe review of Miss Claudine Wilson (*MLR*,

xviii, 491-497) in which she criticises his relative classification of the lives of Thomas à Becket that immediately followed his death. Miss Wilson believes that these all came into existence spontaneously. As representative of Italian literature E. Staaff has analyzed the XVth century Italian MS. B. N. 2104 which contains a collection of *laude*. A considerable portion of these belonged to the convent of Pordenone.

Fittingly, one-third of this volume is devoted to French linguistics: *Fr. chagrin* 'ledsen,' *colère* 'ond' (C. S. R. Collin, in Swedish), *Fr. ici—ainsi, essai d'étymologie* (Kjellman), *Quelques étymologies françaises et provençales*; viz., *chez* < loc. *casae*, *biais* < *bi-aequus*, Prov. *nemes que* < *non minus quam*, *regretter* < *\*regrevitare*, and *tante* < *at-amita* like *atavia*, *adnepos*, etc. (Liljeholm), *Le sort des prépositions cum et apud dans les langues modernes romanes* (Melander), *Klangeffekter i modern franska* (Stenhagen, in Swedish), *Sur la question de l'i dat parasite dans l'ancien français* (Wahlgren), *Egidius* > *Gilles* (Michaëlsson), *Quelques remarques sur les pléonasmes tautologiques* (Nyrop), *Remarques sur la construction active en français* (Biller), *Några franska uttalanden om fransk varsbildning* (Wulff, in Swedish), and *A propos de l'étymologie du français chef* (Wallensköld). There is one lone article on Spanish linguistics, Åke Munthe's *En spansk anakolut* (in Swedish), in which he discusses the type *La que está mano sobre mano, es porque quiere*.

C. S. R. Collin shows how the nouns *chagrin* and *colère* developed adjectival usage. Both are first met as nouns in Olivier Basselin. *Chagrin* is an adjective in Villon and *colère* so appears a hundred years later in Amyot. Probably the types *Il est tout d'ère* (noun) and *Il est tout dévoué* (adj.) were confused in the case of these adjectives and the error spread. Kjellman believes this, *ci* and *cil* are original forms. In *icil* and *cil* the demonstrative prefix *i-* spread from *iluec* and *iqui* where it is etymological. *Ainsi* is a mingling of *ensi* < *in* + *sic* and Poitevin *eissi* < Prov. *aissi*. Stenhagen has classified the various syllable repetitions used in Modern French for stylistic effect. They are: alliteration, syllable repetition with vowel change (e. g., *dogue, dague, digue*), nursery speech (e. g., *fifille*), puns upon proper names, pet names, and onomatopoeic repetitions (e. g., *froufrou*). In several instances his examples are not well grouped. Under alliteration he places certain rich rhymes once peculiar to the *Rhétoriciens*.

Wahlgren believes that the parasitic *i* in eastern dialects is a mere graphic device to indicate that the preceding vowel is open, save in *ui* where it denotes the umlaut and in *ei* < *a* where it has a phonetic value. How does he explain the frequent *graphies inverses*? Wulff has published letters from G. Paris, Paul Meyer and E. Rostand, apropos of his *La rythmicité de l'alexandrin*

*français* (Lund, 1900). He closes with remarks on the *schemata* of Clair Tisseur's poems.

To my mind the most interesting of these philologic articles is Wallensköld's observations on the word *chef*. The discussion resolves itself into a treatment of the problem of the labials *p*, *b*, *v*, (and *f*) before final *-ũ* and *-õs* as in *\*strēpum*, *tūbum*, *clavum* etc. This subject has been previously treated by Neumann, Foerster, Stimming, Meyer-Lubke, and Zauner. Wallensköld believes that the *p* resulted regularly in final *f*, but *b*, *v*, (and *f*), which were a stage farther along in their development, became *w*. Practically all of the exceptions to *p* < *f* are words of Germanic origin in which *p* very closely approximated a *b*. Lou he explains from *lūpum* by the proximity of the *ō*. But he is forced to admit the difficulty in such inconsistencies as *uef* < *ovum*, *rif* < *rvum*, *sif* < *sebum*. He asks in explanation, "Faut-il y voir des formes dialectales où *f* représenterait un *-u* plus ancien?" This to me is the keystone of the whole problem.

The English articles are: *The English Place-Names Etchells, Nechells* (Ekwall), *The Origin of the English Affirmative Particle aye 'yes' < M. E. i-wisse* (Sundén), *Le mot viking < viking 'citadin'* (Wadstein), and *Some English Place-Names in a French Garb* (Zachrisson). The remaining articles are devoted to Swedish, Greek and Latin, and one Celtic subject (etymologies of *scoth*, *leamh*, and *gwelw*, by Lidén).

The typography of this volume is excellent and misprints do not appear to exist.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

Univers<sup>es</sup><sub>ur</sub> of North Carolina.

al.

---

*Le Français, Langue-Diplomatique Moderne, étude critique de conciliation internationale*, par JAMES BROWN SCOTT. Paris: A. Pédone, 1924. x + 326 pp.

Ce volume présente un grand mélange d'argumentation lyrique et de données scientifiques. L'auteur est un partisan enthousiaste du français comme langue diplomatique internationale. Il vise deux publics, le grand public et le public académique; et il les atteint tous les deux. Ce serait montrer un regrettable pédantisme si le public académique se laissait rebuter par les pages de lyrisme. *Les faits sont là*: et les savants les trouveront tous parfaitement scientifiques; tout ce qu'ils pourront objecter c'est que, pour eux qui sont accoutumés aux démonstrations, il en est parfois plus que nécessaire.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Il y a cependant une exception. Comment se fait-il, que M. Scott, qui

Voici, ramenés à la proportion d'un squelette les résultats de ce long examen. La légende du traité de Nymègue, "premier traité rédigé en français, et rédigé en français parce que Louis XIV l'aurait exigé" est démolie; le traité de Nymègue est en latin, et il n'y a pas trace d'aucune tentative de Louis XIV de suggérer l'emploi du français. Le premier traité, dont une partie est en français (les clauses entre le roi de France et l'empereur) est celui de Rastatt, 1714. Et la cause de l'emploi du français est peu édifiante: les représentants des deux gouvernements devaient mettre en latin le texte rédigé provisoirement en français; or, ils se fatiguèrent de ce travail, et signèrent en disant: nous accepterons ce français, mais notre action ne constituera pas un précédent.<sup>2</sup> Et depuis, pour tous les grands traités, on adopta cette manière paresseuse—; y compris le traité entre la France et l'Amérique, le 6 février 1778, rédigé en français et dans "la langue des États-Unis"; *l'original était le français*, mais toujours il y avait la réserve que *cela ne formerait point un exemple* (p. 81). La première fois que tombe la réserve c'est en 1856 au congrès de Paris mettant fin aux hostilités entre la Russie et la Turquie. Quelques conventions internationales non politiques furent aussi rédigées en français; là aussi ce fut un usage, pas plus.

Et alors quoi? D'abord M. Brunot, ni M. Scott ne nous ont dit si le latin avait jamais été officiellement établi comme langue diplomatique.<sup>3</sup> Tout ce que nous savons c'est que le latin était d'usage, et *considéré* comme officiel au moment où la possibilité du remplacement par le français se présenta, au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Et après cela? Tout ce que nous savons est purement négatif encore: à savoir que jamais le latin n'a été révoqué officiellement comme langue diplomatique; que d'autre part jamais le français n'a été reconnu officiellement; ni n'a été écarté; ni l'anglais établi (au traité de Versailles trois langues furent finalement reconnues officielles,—anglais, français, italien—, mais aucun des textes n'est officiellement reconnu comme l'original . . . : donc, rien, rien, rien! Il n'y a que les circonstances qui aient décidé à chaque fois, et qui, selon toute probabilité, continueront à décider dans l'avenir.

C'est tout ce qui, pour l'étudiant, ressort clairement du livre de M. Scott—et qui, en vérité, n'est pas tout à fait favorable à la thèse de l'auteur, à savoir que l'on ravit un *droit* au français en ne

mentionne tant de traités, omette de parler de celui de Portsmouth, New-Hampshire, qui mit fin au conflit Russo-Japonais en 1904, et qui fut rédigé en russe, japonais, anglais et français,—le français étant le texte autorisé en cas de discussion

<sup>2</sup> Pour ses données jusqu'à ce point, M. Scott en réfère constamment à l'autorité de F. Brunot, *Histoire de la Langue Française des origines à 1900*. Tome V. Deuxième Partie. Livre IV (pp. 387-431).

<sup>3</sup> Nous croyons que l'Eglise a adopté le latin officiellement, mais *où?*, et *quand?*

l'employant pas en toute circonstance comme langue internationale diplomatique. Mais l'étudiant lui-même sera-t-il si morose qu'il ne s'amusera pas des jolis incidents,—qui sont des digressions peut-être,—rapportés par M. Scott; par exemple le grand débat pour savoir si la compagnie de navigation, *The American Line* doit continuer à imprimer ses menus en français (voyez *New York Times*, 13 octobre 1923), ou les délicieuses pages au sujet du congrès féministe international de Rome (la même année 1923), et sur les passions soulevées par les susceptibilités des parlars nationaux, la discussion aboutissant à une nouvelle et parfaite scène de Tour de Babel (p. 289).

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Smith College.*

---

*La Comédie italienne. L'Improvisation, les canevas, vies, caractères, portraits, masques des illustres personnages de la commedia dell'arte*, par PIERRE LOUIS DUCHARTRE (Paris, Librairie de France. 1924).

Of many books on the drama published recently this compilation by P. L. Duchartre is one of the two or three most sumptuous. Beautifully printed on fine paper and illustrated by scores of small and large, colored and black-and-white reproductions of old plates and paintings, the volume is more valuable as a work of art than as a scholarly history. The author, indeed, in his commentary on the various parts of his study indicated in his subtitle, tries to avoid a scholarly tone and by his incomplete bibliography and his rare and sketchy foot-notes, shows that he is writing chiefly for a semi-popular audience and only incidentally for specialists in theatrical history. Specialists, however, cannot quite ignore him; though they find his material given more accurately and fully by D'Ancona, Rasi, and others, they will be unable to see anywhere else in such a rich synthesis the visual record of Italian comedy and its masked characters. The beautiful reproductions of Callot's designs and of a curious series of Dutch eighteenth-century plates, *La maladie merveilleuse d'Arlequin*, are alone worth the price of the book.

WINIFRED SMITH.

*Vassar College.*

---

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume XLI

March, 1926

Number 3

---

---

## SPENSER'S DRAGON

BY WHITNEY WELLS

Critics have dismissed many elements of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* as mere romance convention,<sup>1</sup> thus unnecessarily limiting much recent Spenser investigation. In the following study of one of the most royal of Spenser's purple patches, the description of the dragon in Book I, Canto XI, of the *Faerie Queene*, I have endeavored to ascertain not only what specific romance elements the poet here controlled, but those works to which one can point definitely as provenience for his monstrous and horrible beast.

It is unfortunate that the host, so soon adjuring the dignity of God, stinted Chaucer of his *Tale of Sir Thopas*. The knight of the seemingly nose may very easily have encountered some creature more dread than the buck and hare of his kitchen-garden forest—more dread even than Sir Olyfaunt!—perhaps a dragon. That here was fit sport for Chaucer's pen, out of "rhymes lerned longe agoon," but a superficial study of the romances reveals; although what dainty thing Chaucer might have made of it, what details he would have selected to parody, are conjecture only. Awe and sophistication have little in common, and the romance monsters are an unterrifying lot.

This latter fact, a truism to any one at all acquainted with the romances, becomes particularly apparent when comparison is made with Spenser's description. First, Spenser's monster is much larger than the ordinary "wine-tun"<sup>2</sup> beast of the romances:

<sup>1</sup> Most recently, F. I. Carpenter: *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser*, Chicago, 1923, p. 166; and L. Winstanley: *The Faerie Queene, Book I*, Cambridge, 1915, p. xlv.

<sup>2</sup> The favorite object of comparison used by the romance writers: *Sir Eglamour of Artois* (*The Thornton Romances*, London, 1884, l. 778);

each scale is a brazen shield,<sup>3</sup> each wing a sail supported with mainyards,<sup>4</sup> each eye a huge glaring lamp,<sup>5</sup> each claw sharper than stings or sharpest steel,<sup>6</sup> figures not met with in the descriptions of the comparatively puny romance creatures. Every part of Spenser's dragon is glorified, and gains by such magnificence

---

*Bevis of Hampton* (EETS ES XLVI; l. 2673), etc. The writers were also unimaginatively specific: Guy of Warwick's dragon measures 'pritti fote' (EETS ES XLII; l. 7293); *Bevis of Hampton's*, 'fourre and twenti fot, saunfaile' (l. 2670); Sir Degaré's 'xxii fote' (Utterson, *Select Pieces of Early English Popular Poetry*, London, 1817, l. 312), etc. The serpent guarding the Castle of Adamant in *Huon of Bordeaux* (EETS ES XL; p. 374) is merely 'heyer then any hors,' a figure repeated later in the description of the griffin (*Ibid.*, p. 426). Such specifications, however unimaginative, quite definitely prescribe the size limits of the romance dragon. Spenser's magnificent monster has no prototype in the romances.

<sup>3</sup> The romance simile, seldom further elaborated, for a dragon's scales was 'hard ase eni bras' (*Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2676). Cf. *Sir Degaré*, l. 316; *Sir Eglamour*, l. 775; *Sabra and the Seven Champions* (London, 1766), p. 15, etc. Some variants of the object compared may be noted, thus 'stone' (*Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2677), 'flint' (*Sir Tristrem*, in Kolbing, *Tristan Saga*, Heilbronn, 1878, l. 1452), etc. Spenser here uses the conventional brass figure, the shields according with the huge size of his creature. Cf. below, p. 146.

<sup>4</sup> The wings of the romance dragon were usually ordinary and seldom more than mentioned. In *Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2675, they 'schon so be glas'; in *Sir Eglamour*, l. 776, they are 'grene as any gras'; in *Sir Torrent of Portingale* (EETS ES LI), l. 546, 'long and wyght,' etc. Many were apparently wingless (*Sir Tristrem*, *Sir Degaré*, *Huon of Bordeaux*, etc.), and nowhere is there a hint of Spenser's splendid similes.

<sup>5</sup> In general, emphasis upon a dragon's eyes was omitted in the romances, although many of the writers drew attention to their fire-darting property. So, in the *Wars of Alexander* (EETS ES XLVII), l. 3871, 'flawmes feruent as fyre, floze fra paire ezen'; in *Sir Degaré*, l. 315, 'his eyen were bright as any glasse,' etc. *Huon of Bordeaux* approaches most near to Spenser's stanza, since Huon's griffin has 'eyen as great as a hasyn, and more redder than the mouthe of a fornays' (p. 427) and the earlier serpent has 'eyen lyke ii torches brynning' (p. 374). But even these pale beside the 'two bright, shining shieldes,' and 'glaring lampes' with their attendant fatalities that Spenser describes.

<sup>6</sup> The dragon's claws were seldom part of a dragon description in the romances, although when described fall into a conventional mould. Thus, in *Sir Degaré* (l. 309), 'as a lyon . . . was hys feete'; in *Guy of Warwick* (l. 7165), etc. Spenser makes no use of this simile, of course, and the greater effect is apparent.



not the prettiness that the *Morte Arthure* poet and Malory<sup>7</sup> attained in their descriptions, but something very nearly approaching wonder.

Undoubtedly Spenser used the romance animals in his dragon description, as he did romance motifs in the combat that immediately ensues. The first spear-thrust glances off the beast's hide as happens in nearly every romance;<sup>8</sup> the dragon's tail becomes his chief weapon;<sup>9</sup> there is an episode in the *Huon*<sup>10</sup> that may easily have furnished the hint for the flight through the heavens; the knight first wounds the creature under the wing as do Guy of Warwick, Bevis of Hampton, and St. George;<sup>11</sup> the knight is scorched by the fiery breath as is Sir Tristrem;<sup>12</sup> parallelisms to the Well and Tree of Life have been pointed out in both *Bevis of Hampton* and *Huon of Bordeaux*;<sup>13</sup> like Sir Torrent and the Knight of Courtesy, the knight hacks off the creature's tail;<sup>14</sup> the dragon's foot that clutches the shield is amputated as in the *Huon*;<sup>15</sup> the mortal thrust is given down the beast's throat as it is also by *Huon*;<sup>16</sup> finally, the people flee the dead dragon as they do in *Sir Eglamour of Artois*.<sup>17</sup> There is not an episode of the struggle but can be directly traced to one or more romances. The combat, then, is a composite glare of romance high-lights; where one or two sufficed the romance original, Spenser took all. But

<sup>7</sup> *Morte Arthure*, EETS VIII, l. 760 ff.; and Malory, *Morte Darthur*, Book v, Chapter 4.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Sabra and the Seven Champions*, p. 15; *Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2769 ff.; *Huon of Bordeaux*, p. 382; *Sir Tristrem*, l. 1447 ff.; *Guy of Warwick*, l. 7211 ff.; *Sir Degaré*, l. 327 ff., etc.

<sup>9</sup> *Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2846 ff.; *Huon of Bordeaux*, p. 382; *Sir Torrent*, l. 552; *Guy of Warwick*, l. 7248; *Sir Degaré*, l. 342 ff.; *The Knight of Courtesy* (in Ritson, *Ancient English Metrical Romances*, Vol. III, p. 172 ff.), l. 249 ff., etc.

<sup>10</sup> *Huon of Bordeaux*, p. 430 ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Guy of Warwick*, l. 7281; *Bevis of Hampton*, l. 2527 (M text); *Sabra and the Seven Champions*, p. 15.

<sup>12</sup> *Sir Tristrem*, l. 1470 ff.

<sup>13</sup> For example, by L. Winstanley, *op. cit.*, pp. xli, xlviii.

<sup>14</sup> *Sir Torrent*, l. 559; *The Knight of Courtesy*, l. 260.

<sup>15</sup> *Huon of Bordeaux*, p. 431.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 382.

<sup>17</sup> Ll. 784 ff.

this does not hold for his dragon description; for here in only one or two minor details has he followed the romances.

Oddly enough, in the few cases where he most makes use of the conventions, critics have insisted on pointing his sources. Thus Miss Winstanley holds that "Spenser certainly copies Sir Bevis of Southampton in his description of the fight with the dragon,"<sup>18</sup> citing as one of the closest parallels the *Bevis*,

His skales brighter were than glasse  
And moche harder than any brasse

and Spenser's

And over, all with brasen scales was armed.

But brazen scales were, perhaps, the most typical attribute of the romance dragon, as I have indicated, and an identity may just as easily be established, for instance, with *Sir Degaré*, *Sir Eglamour of Artois*, or *Sabra and the Seven Champions*, all of which contain further parallelisms to support the provenience. In his earlier poem, *Visions of the Worlds Vanitie*, Spenser gave the dragon there

. . . shields of brasse, that shone like burnisht gold,

(Stanza vi)

in which respect his *Faerie Queene* dragon is slightly more elaborated.

Again, Miss Winstanley and others find the

Three ranckes of yron teeth

in Ovid's

triplici stant ordine dentes.<sup>19</sup>

Although this feature was not a convention of the romances, it was common to the popularly conceived idea of the dragon and to a number of fabulous creatures. Another classical instance might be drawn from Nicander

Triplici conspicui se produnt ordine dentes<sup>20</sup>

and Topsell describes the dragons as "hauing a treble rowe of

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. xlv.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 284. Cf. also Todd's edition, London, 1805, Vol. III, p. 157. Upton (London, 1758, Vol. II, p. 414), cites Daniel, VII, 7.

<sup>20</sup> As quoted by Topsell, *The Historie of Serpents*, London, 1608, p. 159, who cites further poets.

teeth in theyr mouthes vppon euery iawe." The mantichora, according to Gesner, have "dentes triplici utrinque ordine."<sup>22</sup> All of the source citations given for the dragon episode by Miss Winstanley and others may be similarly criticized, although concerning the dragon description *per se* they are conspicuously absent, except for those more conventional details noticed above.

One queries, accordingly, Spenser's description of his dragon, so unconforming to romance outline, and particularly in its juxtaposition to the series of romance episodes inculcated in the combat description. Was some other force, influence, at work, weaning Spenser's ideas from the paltry dragon conception of the romances he undoubtedly had before him, later relinquishing him to them for his combat episodes? And was this force entirely his own imagination and genius?

With allowance always for the latter factors, Spenser would have given us an animal comparable in many ways to Stephen Hawes' dragon in *The Pastime of Pleasure* had he pursued the method in describing his beast that he used in the combat. As painters have sometimes amused themselves with quite literally depicting the poet's mistress—actual pearls for teeth, full-blown roses on the cheeks, a swan's brow, shell ears—so Hawes, in all seriousness and very bad verse, creates an actual romance dragon with a result as ludicrous as any conception of these painters.<sup>22</sup> Hawes used all the conventional romance details—his beast, in fact, may be used as a guide to them<sup>23</sup>—and the clanking automaton is one of the curiosities of literature.

Perhaps Spenser knew this product of Hawes<sup>24</sup> and was aware of the inadequacy of its effect; at least, he realized the impotency

<sup>21</sup> Conrad Gesner, *Historia Animalium*, Zurich, 1555, Lib. I, p. 631.

<sup>22</sup> *The Pastime of Pleasure*, London, 1845, p. 192.

<sup>23</sup> Allowing for the influence of Nebuchadnezzar's image which is similarly apparent in his conception.

<sup>24</sup> There may be some slight hint in Spenser's

Eftsoones he gan aduaunce his haughty crest,  
As chauffed bore his bristles doth upreare

(*FQ*, I, xi, 15)

and Hawes'

His backe afore, lyke brystles of a swyne,  
Of the fine copper did moost clerely shyne.

(*P of P*, p. 192)

of the romance dragon that Hawes so unwittingly parodies. Custom had not staled the variety of fight episodes, or at least the poet saw that evasion of the ridiculous consisted in making that variety infinite. But custom had quite decidedly staled the dragon itself, which no amount of conventional variety could redeem, as Hawes' attempt proves. Where, then, lay the escape?

Investigation of the classics or of the poets more immediately prior to Spenser does not help. Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, Occleve, and the writers of the dead season—Hawes,<sup>25</sup> Skelton, Heywood, and others—contain no such conception. Gascoigne, the euphuistic conceits of Pettie and Lyly are as similarly absurd proveniences, and dragons have almost no place in the ballads.

The romances themselves furnish a hint, and may very well have served Spenser the same office since, as the combat episodes prove, he had them before him. The writer of *Sir Degaré* concludes his description of the dragon with

He was to loke on as I you tell,  
As it had bene a fiende of hell, (l. 321 ff.)

in *Sir Tristrem* the creature is called "*pe deuél dragoun*" (l. 1451), and in *Huon of Bordeaux*, "the beest semyd rather an enemye of hel then any other beest." (p. 381.) The like simile occurs in many romances,<sup>26</sup> and Hawes' beast in *The Example of Virtue* is also an inhabitant of hell.<sup>27</sup> As is well-known, in the early miracle-plays "the *infernum* or hell (was) conventionally represented by the head and open gullet of a monstrous dragon,"<sup>28</sup> a further attestation to the medieval idea of the dragon as a power for evil.

Another key is furnished by Spenser's allegory. To quote Miss Winstanley:

The Redcrosse Knight represents man in his search for Holiness; his

<sup>25</sup> Hawes has another dragon in *The Example of Virtue* (*The Dunbar Anthology*, London, 1901, p. 268 ff.), a stilted creature with three heads—the World, the Flesh, and the Devil—modelled on the hydra of Hercules' fame.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. particularly, *Sir Eglamour*, l. 735; *Sir Tristrem*, l. 1440; *Sabra and the Seven Champions*, p. 15; *The Knight of Courtesy*, l. 240, etc.

<sup>27</sup> Hawes, *The Example of Virtue*, pp. 271, 286.

<sup>28</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, Oxford, 1903, II, p. 86.

great task is the slaying of the dragon of sin which keeps mankind (i. e. the parents of Una) in subjection.<sup>29</sup>

Dodge considers the dragon as representative of the devil,<sup>30</sup> Court-hope, also, 'the evil one.'<sup>31</sup> The slight differences are unimportant since, in any event, the dragon is symbolic of an occupant of hell. So Spenser considers him, referring to the creature as 'that huge feend' (I, XI, 3), 'that infernall monster' (I, XI, 31), 'damned feend' (I, XI, 35), and 'hell-bred beast' (I, XI, 40). It is the Other-world vision-pieces, then—those Odysseys of entranced souls—that may aid toward a solution of the problem.

The Apocalypse of John may be immediately dismissed since Spenser had already used its dragon as palfrey for Duessa, the gift of Orgoglio (*FQ*, I, VII, 16 ff.). There is no hint of it in the dragon description under discussion. The classical descriptions of Hades are similarly inconsequent. Dante's Satan, whose wings

vele di mar non vid'io mai cotali (*Inferno*, XXXIV, 48)

may have served as the hint for Spenser's similar though more elaborate description, but since there is no other intimation of Spenser's use of the *Inferno* fiends and monsters, it must stand alone.

The piece that concerns the present study particularly, however, is *The Vision of Tundale*,<sup>32</sup> one of the best known and certainly one of the most elaborate of the medieval visions. Its popularity

<sup>29</sup> P. viii.

<sup>30</sup> R. E. N. Dodge, *The Complete Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*, Cambridge Edition, 1908, p. 816.

<sup>31</sup> *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, 1911, III, 233.

<sup>32</sup> In the vision of Drihtelm (Bede, v, 12), there is no monster to horrify the unhappy initiate; nor is there in the two shorter visions that follow this account. *The Vision of the Monk of Evesham*, printed 1482 by William de Machlinia, contains devils, fire-darting 'worms,' and 'grete bestys,' but there is no more elaboration of description than occurs in the Bede. *The Vision of Thurcill* may be similarly dismissed. In *The Vision of St. Paul*, the eleven pains involve an intimate acquaintance with poisonous reptiles, a lake full of venomous serpents, and horned devils; but in none of its six redactions is there any monster or elaborateness of description. *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, *The Harrowing of Hell*, *Brandon's Voyage*, Deguileville's *Pelerinage de l'Ame* (translated by Caxton, 1483) may also be mentioned as containing no indication of their use by Spenser at this point.

is indicated by the survival of a great number of manuscripts in Latin, French, German, and Norse.<sup>33</sup> Wagner lists fifty-four of the Latin, and of an English version four manuscripts are extant, all of the fifteenth century.<sup>34</sup> This editor dates the English original at the end of the fourteenth century, finding it a translation of one of the most elaborate Latin versions. It is quite possible, then, even probable, owing to a popularity thus evidenced, that Spenser was acquainted with the *Vision of Tundale*.

In his vision, Tundale, guided by an angel, descends into Hell and passes through a valley strewn with hot coals, beside a mountain of fire and ice. Yawning abysses, fiery ovens, pillars of flame, are other details. But what concern the present study particularly are the huge beast called Acheron, the beast in the lake of ice, the terrible creatures in the lakes of fire and water, Satan and his fiends. Comparison of their descriptions with Spenser will indicate, I believe, the true original of the latter's dragon.<sup>35</sup>

Issuing from a long way of mirkiness, Tundale and his guardian angel

. . . se þan a hedewes sight:  
þai se a beste was more to knaw,  
þan alle þe mountaynes, þat þai saw,  
And his ene ȝete semed more  
And bradder, þan þe valeys wore (VT, 440 ff.)

and Satan is also huge:

He was bothe mekille and stronge,  
A hundred cubites was he longe.  
Fourti cubytes on brede he hadde  
And nine on theknes was he made. (VT, 1311 ff.)

So, in Spenser,

Eftsoones that dreadfull dragon they espyde,  
Where stretcht he lay upon the sunny side  
Of a great hill, *himselfe like a great hill* . . .  
And made wide shadow under his huge waste;  
*As mountaine doth the valley overcaste.* (FQ, I, xi, 4 ff.)

<sup>33</sup> A. Wagner, *Visio Tundali*, Erlangen, 1882, p. ix ff.

<sup>34</sup> A. Wagner, *Tundale*, Halle, 1893, p. ix ff.; p. xxxix.

<sup>35</sup> I have used for quotation the composite text of the English version published by Wagner. The italics are mine.

The beast Acheron, again,

*In at his mouth, þat was so wyde,  
Nyne thousand armed men myght in ryde.  
Betwene his tuskes, þat were so longe,  
Two grete geandes se he honge.  
þe hede of þat one hengid alle downe  
And þat otheris hede agaynes his croune,  
In myddis his mouth on ilke a syde,  
Pileris were sette to hold hit up wyde.  
Tho pyleris were sette on sere wyse:  
In his mouthe were thre partyse,  
As thre gret zattes, þat open stode;  
Grete flammes of fyr out at hit zode,  
And þerewith come as foule a stynke,  
As tonge may telle or hert thinke. (VT, 445 ff.)*

and Spenser:

*. . . his deepe devouring jawes  
Wyde gaped, like the griesly mouth of hell,  
Through which into his dark abysses all ravin fell.  
And, that more wondrous was, in either jaw  
Three ranckes of yron teeth enraunged were,  
In which yett trickling blood and gobbets raw  
Of late devoured bodies did appeare,  
That sight thereof bredd cold congealed feare:  
Which to increase, and all atonce to kill,  
A cloud of smothering smoke and sulphure seare  
Out of his stinking gorge forth steemed still,  
That all the ayre about with smoke and stench did fill.*

(FQ, I, xi, 12 ff.)

Satan's mouth is *fulle wyde* (VT, l. 1333) and he thrusts souls into it:

*He swolowed hem agayne ilkone  
With smoke and stynke of brymstone. (VT, 1375 ff.)*

Another beast in a lake of ice,

*Fyre, þat myght never sleked be,  
Out at his mouthe flew gret plente. (VT, 871 ff.)*

Spenser:

*From his infernall founnace forth he threw  
Huge flames, that dimmed all the hevrens light,  
Enrold in duskish smoke and brimstone blew. (FQ, I, xi, 44.)*

Over a bridge, scarcely the breadth of one hand, Tundale is forced to drive a cow, while in the water beneath wait ugly beasts whose

*. . . ene wer brode and brennand bryght,  
As brennand lampes dose on nyght, (VT, 557 ff.)*

and some fiends are met later whose eyes also,

*. . . were brennyng wonper brade.  
As brennyng lampes lyght pai ware,  
And grymly gon pai on hym stare. (VT, 1232 ff.)*

Spenser:

*His blazing eyes, like two bright shining shieldes,  
Did burne with wrath, and sparkled living fyre;  
As two broad beacons . . .  
But far within, as in a hollow glade,  
Those glaring lampes were sett, that made a dreadfull shade.*  
(FQ, I, XI, 14)

The beast in the lake of ice,

*Two grete wynges, þat weron blake,  
Stode on eyther syde his bake, (VT, 861 ff.)*

and the devils

*. . . hade wynges longe and brade:  
As bake wynges were þai made.  
With her wynges myght þai fly,  
Wheder þai wold, lowe or hy, (VT, 1243 ff.)*

but Spenser's description in this place more nearly follows Dante.<sup>30</sup>

Again, concerning the beast in the lake of ice,

*Two fete with nayles of irne and stele  
He had, þat were ful scharpe to fele, (VT, 863 ff.)*

and the fiends,

*. . . hade nayles on her clokes,  
þat wer lyke anker hokes;  
As þai wer made al of stele,  
þe poyntes were ful scharpe to fele, (VT, 1239 ff.)*

and Satan has on each hand,

*Twenty fyngeris with nayles kene . . .*

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. above, p. 149; also, below, p. 157.



*His nayles semed of irne stronge,  
 Fullscharpe þai were, gret and longe,  
 Longere þan ever was ony spere,  
 þat armed knyghtes ar wont to bere. (VT, 1320 ff.)*

Spenser<sup>37</sup>:

*But stinges and sharpest steele did far exceed  
 The sharpnesse of his cruel rending claws. (FQ, I, xi, 12)*

Finally, the bodies of the fiends

*. . . were like dragones  
 And here tayles lyke scorpiones, (VT, 1237 ff.)*

and Satan's tail

*. . . was scharpe and of gret lenght,  
 And in hit hade he gret strenght.  
 In his tayle was mony a pyke,  
 With hit tho soules gon he stryke. (VT, 1335 ff.)*

So in the huge long tayle of Spenser's dragon are two stings

*Both deadly sharp, that sharpest steele exceeden farr.  
 (FQ, I, xi, 11)*

These parallels differ, of course, as one should anticipate. It would be a complete miscomprehension of Spenser's method and genius to expect a verbatim rendering. At least, they are closer than any comparisons involving the romance dragons except in those instances cited before. That the creatures of Tundale's hell furnished the basic hints for the poet's conception, particularly in its idea of vastness, seems likely, and there is further evidence.

Tundale enters a dale containing a smithy where the souls of those who haunted folly are heated and hammered out (VT, 1010 ff.). In Book II, Canto 7, of the *Faerie Queene*, the cave of Mammon also contains a smithy presided over by fiends who stop at the sight of Guyon much in the manner of Tundale's devils. The following are the most striking parallels:

*. . . smythes aboute hem zode . . .  
 Tho smythes wer ugly on to loke. (VT, 1014 ff.)  
 By every founnace many feendes did byde,  
 Deformed creatures, horrible in sight . . .  
 And ugly shapes . . . (FQ, II, vii, 35 ff.)*

<sup>37</sup> Spenser, it should be noted, conceived his beast as two-footed, proved by the combat. Cf. *FQ*, I, xi, 42, 43.

*With gret belyes at hym pai blewe,  
As hit wer irne to make newe. (VT, 1045 ff.)*

*One with great bellowes gathered filling ayre,  
And with forst wind the fewell did inflame. (FQ, II, vii, 36.)*

*With gret hammers in her hande  
And gret tonges hote gloand. (VT, 1015 ff.)*

*Another did the dying bronds repayre  
With yron tongs . . . (FQ, II, vii, 36.)*

*In gret fires pai gon hem cast  
And sithen with hammers layde on fast.  
þe mayster of þe smithyes was balde,  
Ulcani was his name calde. (VT, 1021 ff.)*

*. . . and sprinckled ofte the same,  
With liquid waves, fiers Vulcans rage to tame,  
Who, maystring them, renewd his former heat. (FQ, II, vii, 36.)*

It is at least conceivable that the *Vision of Tundale* may have furnished the hint for Spenser's conception. The remainder of the Canto, too, is a 'vision piece,' although the classical Hades is more evidently Spenser's model. The gold chain of Ambition may have been suggested by a sight in Tundale's paradise:

*From the firmament above her hede  
Come mony bryght bemes into þat stede,  
From the whylke chaynes hange monyfolde,  
Shynand full bryght of fyne gold . . .  
And angelles flowe ay amonge. (VT, 1969 ff.)*

Spenser:

*She held a great gold chaine ylincked well,  
Whose upper end to highest heven was knitt . . .  
And all that preace did rownd about her swell,  
To catchen hold of that long chaine, thereby  
To climbe aloft. . . (FQ, II, vii, 46.)*

Miss Winstanley devotes an amount of effort<sup>22</sup> to proving that *Bevis of Hampton* furnished the source for Spenser's Well of Life, gliding over the more obvious discrepancies. Bevis, like the Red Cross Knight, is bowled over into a well by the dragon's tail:

The narrative goes on to explain, however, that the well was of such

<sup>22</sup> Pp. xlv ff.

virtue that no dragon or other venomous creature could approach within seven feet of it; it owed that power to the fact that a holy virgin had bathed therein. . . . Bevis gladly avails himself of the virtues of the well.

. . .

Miss Winstanley then begins to gloss over certain facts:

Spenser does not give the legend of the saintly nymph who bathed in the well, for he wishes to bestow upon it still more wonderful properties and to make it emblematic of the well of life. . . . Spenser does not explain that the properties of the well kept the dragon away; perhaps he leaves that to be assumed.

But perhaps Spenser does not give the legend of the nymph nor explain the dragon's adverseness to the well because his true model did not! Furthermore this model may have been an *actual* Well of Life that occurs in the 'earthly paradise' of Tundale's vision.

Issuing from hell, Tundale and his guide enter a flowery mead where

*In myddes þat place was a welle,  
þe fayrest, þat ony tonge myght of telle.  
Fro þat ran mony stremes sere  
Of water, þat was fayre and clere . . .  
'þe welle, þat þou has sene here,  
Wþ þe water, þat sprynges so clere,  
Is called þe skylle þe welle of lyffe.  
þe name of hit is fulle ryfe. (VT, 1531 ff.)*

Spenser:

*Behynd his backe, unweeting, where he stood,  
Of auncient time there was a springing well,  
From which fast trickled forth a silver flood . . .  
. . . . it rightly hot  
The Well of Life. . . . (FQ, I, xl, 29)*

The fountain in the *Bevis* does *not* heal the knight of his wounds, but merely keeps the dragon and its venom away; a fact that Miss Winstanley is forced to note that Spenser does not use. In *Tundale*, however, the guide says to the hero,

*Tho soules, þat þou ses her within,  
Have ben in payne for her synne,  
But þai are clensed throw goddis grace  
And dwellen now her in þis place . . .  
Who so drynkes her of þis welle,*

Honger shall he never fele  
 Ne threste shall he never mare,  
 But *lyking have withouten care.*  
*If he were olde, withoute payne*  
*Hit wold make hym zonge agayne.* (VT, 1541 ff.)

Spenser:

Full of great vertues, and for med'eine good. . .  
 For unto life the dead it could restore,  
*And guilt of sinfull crimes cleane wash away;*  
 Those that with sicknesse were infected sore  
 It could recure, *and aged long decay*  
*Renew, as one were borne that very day.* (FQ, I, xi, 29 ff.)

Bevis' well, then, has far less in common with Spenser's well than has Tundale's, although I do not deny that the *Bevis* episode may have furnished the hint to Spenser who, thereupon remembering the well of the vision-piece, used it as his model.

The original hint, however, would seem more likely to have come from the fountain in *Huon of Bordeaux* which is nearer Tundale and, consequently, Spenser.

This fountayne was callyd the fountayne of youth . . . and (Huon) had no soner dronke therof but incontynent he was hole of all his woundys.<sup>39</sup>

Properties that Spenser's and Tundale's wells have in common, however, are not true of Spenser's and Huon's, particularly the name, the cleansing from sin,<sup>40</sup> and the restoration of youth to crabbed age. The last virtue as a quality of Huon's fountain can be inferred only from its name—the fountain of youth.

That the *Huon*, and not the *Bevis*, furnished the point of tangency to the Tundale vision, seems still more certain by the apple tree which stands beside the fountain of youth in the former romance and which Spenser undoubtedly took, as Miss Winstanley has pointed out, for his Tree of Life. There is a tree, similar in many respects however, in Tundale's Paradise (VT, 1200 ff.).

We may consider, then, that the same process took place in this

<sup>39</sup> P. 434.

<sup>40</sup> It is not clear in *The Vision of Tundale* whether this is a property of the well, or whether it indicates an attribute of the inhabitants of the earthly paradise. At least, they drink of the Well of Life and the sin-cleansed quality may have been easily transferred by Spenser.

episode that occurred in the dragon description—the romance in hand pointed to a more elaborate account, the *Vision of Tundale*, that Spenser recognized as superior.

Spenser's use of this source is typical, proved by a similar method in dealing with Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme*.<sup>41</sup> Fulfillment is far flung from the original hint, and the leagues of fairy-land lie between. A more immediate case in point is the description of the dragon's wings. If one grants the Dante provenience—a metaphor of mere broad sails—Spenser has elaborated, given us the sails hollowed by the gathering wind, carried the figure farther into quills 'like mayne-yardes, with flying canvas lynd,' leaving the logic of the climactic Alexandrine unquestioned:

And all the hevens stood still, amazed with his threat.

(FQ, I, xi, 10)

An inquiry into the sources of Spenser's similes has yet to be made and Carpenter sets it as a suggested problem.<sup>42</sup> When it is accomplished, the poet's great use of figures drawn from a knowledge of sea-craft (there are three in the dragon episode, alone<sup>43</sup>) will become apparent. It is this that leads to a doubt of the Dante influence, here. It should be remembered, too, that Spenser's knowledge of the Italian poet is still questionable. But his ability to weave a tapestry from mere gossamer stands clear, whether Dante, the romances, or *Tundale* furnished the basic strand.

If nothing else, then, this study has at least shown that Spenser's dragon is not the creature it is usually considered, having, and only incidentally, very little in common with the ordinary dragon of the romances. Rather is it a true beast from the medieval Hell, compact of the beasts from the hell of *Tundale*.

*Harvard University.*

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. J. L. Lowes, "Spenser and the *Mirour de l'Omme*," *P. M. L. A.*, xxix, 3.

<sup>42</sup> *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser*, p. 305.

<sup>43</sup> FQ, I, xi, 10; 21; xii, 1.

JOSEPH TRAPP AND THE ARISTOTELIAN  
"CATHARSIS"

BY MARVIN T. HERRICK

Present-day students of Aristotle's dramatic criticism are generally inclined to accept without much questioning the so-called 'modern' interpretation of *catharsis* in the famous definition of Tragedy. Bywater, himself one of the ablest exponents of the 'modern' theory, nevertheless has gone to some pains to offer evidence both for and against it. In his elaborate note on the last clause in the definition<sup>1</sup> he recognizes two distinct interpretations of *κάθαρσις*.<sup>2</sup> Following a long line of scholars, we may regard the term as a metaphor from the religious rite of *purification*, or we may take it to be a physiological metaphor from medicine in the sense of *purging*. The first is commonly known as the older interpretation, especially pleasing to the moralizing spirit of Renaissance scholars. It is both ethical and didactic, and fits in well with the fashionable dual function of poetry—to teach and delight. The second, the pathological interpretation, is generally attributed jointly to Weil and Bernays of the nineteenth century. Bywater, however, in the appendix to his edition of the *Poetics* and in the commentary as well, has shown that there are instances of this 'modern' interpretation as far back as the sixteenth century. In an earlier article, entitled *Milton and the Aristotelian Definition of Tragedy*,<sup>3</sup> he has produced numerous extracts from various commentators, mostly Italian, of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, to prove beyond doubt that the pathological meaning of the word was then by no means unknown. His extract from the *Galateo* of Giovanni della Casa, both from the original and from the Elizabethan translation, is of particular interest, since the translation probably represents the first mention of the

<sup>1</sup> Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, Oxford, 1909, 6. 1449<sup>b</sup>27.

<sup>2</sup> G. S. Brett recognizes three interpretations: the pathological, the religious, and the moral. See his *Reflections on Aristotle's View of Tragedy*, in *Philosophical Essays Presented to John Watson*, Kingston, 1922, pp. 158-78.

<sup>3</sup> See *Journal of Philology* 27 (1901). 267-75.

tragic *catharsis* in English. The passage, as Englished by Robert Peterson in 1576, runs as follows: <sup>4</sup>

Albeit, not long since I heard it said to a worthy gentleman our neighbour, that men have many times more need to weep than to laugh. And for that cause, he said, these doleful tales which we call tragedies were devised at first, that when they were played in the theatre (as at that time they were wont) they might draw forth tears out of their eyes, that had need to spend them. And so they were by their weeping healed of their infirmity.

Milton, influenced by the Italian commentators, had some notion of the pathological interpretation. The brief remarks in his preface to *Samson Agonistes* may be quoted here:

Tragedy, as it was antiently compos'd, hath been ever held the gravest, moralest, and most profitable of all other Poems: therefore said by *Aristotle* to be of power by raising pity and fear, or terror, to purge the mind of those and such like passions, that is, to temper and reduce them to just measure with a kind of delight, stirr'd up by reading or seeing those passions well imitated. Nor is Nature wanting in her own effects to make good his assertion: for so in Physic things of melancholic hue and quality are us'd against melancholy, sower against sower, salt to remove salt humours.

It should be noted, however, that on the title page of the drama we find *κάθαρσις* translated as 'lustratio,' indicating that Milton fell in with the prevailing religious interpretation of purification:

Aristot. Poet. Cap. 6. *Τραγωδία μιμήσις πράξεως σπουδαίας*, etc. *Traegodia est imitatio actionis seriae*, etc. *Per misericordiam et metum perficiens talium affectuum lustrationem*.

There seems to be a confusion of the two theories, though the pathological interpretation is surely present.

Of the English critics and scholars in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries who concerned themselves with the Aristotelian *catharsis*, most held to the older conception; <sup>5</sup> the

<sup>4</sup> *Galateo, of Manners and Behaviours in Familiar Conversation*, ed. by Herbert J. Reid, 1892, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Dryden, *Dedication of the Aeneis* (1697), in *Essays*, ed. by Ker, Oxford, 1900, 2. 158: 'To raise, and afterwards to calm the passions—to purge the soul from pride by the examples of human miseries which befall the greatest—in few words, to expel arrogance, and introduce compassion, are the great effects of tragedy.'

influence of the moralizing French critics, particularly Rapin, Dacier, and Le Bossu, was too strong to allow any thing radically different from the didactic view. Milton's venture upon the pathological interpretation seems to have attracted little notice. Yet it did not escape attention. Joseph Trapp (1679-1747), poet, scholar, and pamphleteer, was at least one individual who kept alive the theory touched upon by the author of *Samson Agonistes*.

Trapp was the first professor of poetry at Oxford, and a literary critic of no mean ability. His lectures in Latin were published at Oxford under the title of *Praelectiones Poeticae*, three volumes, the first in 1711, the second in 1715, and the third in 1719. An English translation was published at London in 1742, done by William Clarke and William Bowyer.<sup>6</sup> Trapp's Aristotelianism is largely drawn from Vossius and Dacier, but he is well-acquainted with the Greek original, and often ventures to contradict the commentators. Yet he is a Horatian at heart, a firm believer in the *prodesse* of poetry. So his devotion to Horace, with his admiration for the didactic criticisms of Le Bossu and Rapin, proves too much for his genuine desire to follow Aristotle. Thus he sees fit to revise Aristotle's conception of poetry so as to include the 'im-

---

John Dennis emphasized the religious element in the drama. There is a suggestion of the medical theory in his *Impartial Critick* (cf. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford, 1908, 3. 184-5), where he is following a note of Dacier, but Dennis was a staunch supporter of *purification*. In his *Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry*, London, 1701, p. 67, he writes: 'Terror and compassion, which are the reigning passions in Tragedy, are heightened by religion.'

Charles Gildon takes his definition of Tragedy word for word from a current English translation of Dacier's version of the *Poetics*. 'According to the rules of Aristotle, a Tragedy is the imitation of an allegorical and universal action, which, by the means of terror and compassion, moderates and corrects our inclinations.'—*The Complete Art of Poetry* (1717), in *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Durham, New Haven, 1915, p. 68. Cf. Dacier's Preface, in *Aristotle's Art of Poetry*, London, 1705.

For Addison's discussion of the tragic emotions see *Spectator*, Nos. 40, 42, 418.

<sup>6</sup> Clarke writes to Bowyer that he finds Trapp's lectures very exasperating at times. He has been particularly perplexed over Aristotle's definition of Tragedy. See Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes* 2. 148-50.



provement of mankind' as well as pleasure.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless his interpretation of the important catharsis clause is worth noting; it is by no means free from the conception of purification, yet the medical theory is also vigorously upheld.

Trapp's special discussion of the tragic *catharsis* comes in the twenty-eighth lecture. He proposes to show how Tragedy purges the mind of the passions of pity and terror; why we delight in tragic representations; why the mind is refreshed by that which grieves it—that is, by pity and terror.<sup>8</sup> Trapp's view is essentially that of Milton. The passions are purged<sup>9</sup> by being agitated, just as the 'humours' of the human body are, often by medicines of the same nature: acids by acids, bitter by bitter. Therefore the passions are purged by means of themselves: terror by terror, pity by pity, and the other passions by these two, terror and pity. By subjecting ourselves to dramatic representations of horrible and miserable things we grow more familiar with them, and so our minds are relieved of these perturbations. Trapp admittedly follows Vossius,<sup>10</sup> and evidently he also has Dacier's note<sup>11</sup> in mind. His analogy with the pathological, or medical, functions, however,

<sup>7</sup> Trapp, *Praelectiones Poeticae* l. 17: 'Ars quicquid est, vel mente comprehendendi potest, metricis numeris imitans vel illustrans; voluptatis hominum, atque utilitatis gratia.'

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 3. 90-1: Reliquum est igitur, ut ostendatur qua ratione Tragoedia purgat passiones; idque easdem commovendo; quod contrarium potius effectum videtur promittere: Insuper, ut indicetur, quisnam sit fons et origo delectationis Tragicæ; sive quibus de causis, ex intimis naturæ penetralibus eruendis, mens humana recreetur eo ipso quod doleat, et ex misericordia, ac terrore voluptatem percipiat.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 3. 91-2: Purgandi sunt itaque Affectus, eo ipso quod commoveantur? Maxime: Et quid obstat quo minus? Bilis, et Pituita, alique humores in corpore humano eximi nequeunt, nisi fluctuent et moveantur. Imo sæpenumero expurgatur humor, ejusdem naturæ ac temperiei medicina adhibita; acidus acido, amaro amarus; ac perinde de aliis. Ex Affectibus igitur quidam purgantur per seipsos; Terror scilicet, ac Misericordia: Cæteri per duos istos quos jam nominavimus. Terror inquit, et Misericordia, per seipsos: quia Representatio dramatica res horrendas atque miserabiles assuefacit nobis; ac notas et familiares, adeoque minus horrendas et miserabiles, reddit. 'Per hæc (inquit Vossius) dicitur Tragoedia *περὶ αἰνῶν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν*, purgare, ac levare animum ab hujusmodi perturbationibus.'

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Vossius, *Institutionum Poeticarum Libri Tres*, Book 2, ch. 13.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Dacier, *Aristotle's Art of Poetry*, p. 80: 'Tragedy is a true medi-

is much better sustained than the accounts in either Vossius or Dacier.

For a fuller treatment of the subject Trapp refers his reader to his forth-coming English translation of Virgil. Let us turn, then, to that work, *The Works of Virgil translated into English Blank Verse with Large Explanatory Notes and Critical Observations*, 3 volumes, London, 1731. The first volume appeared in 1718, the second in 1720. In his introductory essay to the fourth book of the *Aeneid* he writes at length on the 'nature and art of moving the passions in Tragedy and Epic Poetry, the usefulness of it, and the causes of the pleasure arising from terrour and pity.' He refers in a footnote<sup>12</sup> to the preface to *Samson Agonistes*, thereby acknowledging the debt he obviously owes to Milton in the lectures as well. Several kinds of poetry, though especially Tragedy, excite all the passions, more particularly the passions of pity and terror:<sup>13</sup>

If it be enquired to what good purpose, then, do they thus excite the passions, I answer, to regulate them, or, as Aristotle expresses it, to purge them. But can they be regulated by being roused, and cooled by being inflamed? Yes, why not? A medicine intended to purge the body must set the humours afloat in order to discharge them, and nothing is more common than to throw a patient into one sort of fever to cure him of another. Nay, very often an ill humour is worked off by a medicine of the same kind with itself—bitter with bitter, acid with acid, and so in other instances. Terrour and pity (meaning the excess of them, for the passions in themselves are good, and are only to be rectified, not extirpated) are by these means corrected; because things frightful and pitiable are rendered familiar to us by fiction. Those passions spend themselves in a great measure upon imaginary objects, and so they will be the less intense and ungovernable, and the mind less likely to be either broken or too much softened whenever it is forced to encounter real ones. In these senses, therefore, a passion by its rapidity may cleanse and clarify, as well as weaken and reduce itself; as a high wind, which is air violently agitated, may dissipate noxious vapours in the air itself, which would otherwise stagnate and breed nourishment for fevers and plagues.

Not only terror and pity are purged, but all other passions as well—

---

cine which purges the passions, since it teaches the ambitious to moderate his ambition, the wicked to fear God, the passionate to restrain his anger, etc.; but 'tis a very agreeable medicine, and works only by pleasure.' The ethical and didactic tone of Dacier is marked even here.

<sup>12</sup> Trapp, *Works of Virgil* 2. 191.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 2. 191-2.

violent love, revenge, anger, envy, ambition, and the like.<sup>14</sup> To this end Tragedy, above all species of poetry, is best adapted. The nearest to it in efficacy is the Epic.

One of Bywater's arguments against regarding the theatre as a school, and the tragic poet as a teacher of morality, is that the performance of Tragedy in ancient Greece was 'too occasional to have a marked and abiding effect on the moral character of the hearers.'<sup>15</sup> From our foregoing quotations it is clear that Trapp, true to his training, did think of the tragic poet as a teacher of morality, and that it is familiarity with tragic scenes that brings about the tragic purgation. Yet he seems to have anticipated Bywater's argument:<sup>16</sup>

The agitation of his mind soon rests and subsides: the least diversion of ideas reduces it to its usual temper—hi motus animorum, etc. Pulveris exigui jactu, etc. And then come the good effects above-mentioned upon cool thought and reflection. The organical part of the mind (if I may so speak) is only played upon, as an instrument, and the motion soon ceases after the artist discontinues his performance.

There is no doubt that Trapp was a moralizer and a firm believer in the didactic aim of poetry. As a student of the French Aristotelian commentators and critics he could hardly have been otherwise. His conception of the tragic *catharsis*, therefore, was bound to be colored by the prevailing moral tone of his generation. Perhaps, if he had been pressed to remark on the point, he would have preferred the meaning of 'cleansing' and 'clarifying.' On the other hand, a pathological interpretation was also in his mind, more marked in his case than the mere suggestions in Vossius and Dacier, more marked even than the famous passage in Milton. Trapp confused the two conceptions, it is true, as indeed many a critic before him had done, but few men before the nineteenth century have offered a more pronounced support of the 'modern' theory. In Trapp's day the time had not yet come for a sharp differentiation of the two views. It is to Weil, Bernays, Bywater, and Aristotelian scholars of the present day that we owe our clear distinctions.

Ames, Iowa.

---

<sup>14</sup> Here Trapp contradicts Aristotle, who maintains that pity and fear are the only emotions producing the true tragic pleasure. Cf. *Poetics*, 14. 1453<sup>b</sup>9-14. <sup>15</sup> Bywater, p. 161. <sup>16</sup> Trapp, *Works of Virgil* 2. 192-3.

## ALBERT GLATIGNY: A STUDY IN LITERARY RELATIONSHIPS

BY AARON SCHAFFER

The life of Albert Glatigny, the poet-actor whom Catulle Mendès has styled "le premier des Parnassiens,"<sup>1</sup> has been the subject of a somewhat shoddy biography by E. Kuhn, writing under the pseudonym of Job-Lazare, and of much legendizing on the part of Mendès.<sup>2</sup> By far the most flagrant error of which Job-Lazare has been guilty is to be found in his dating of the poet's birth.<sup>3</sup> This error was rectified by Anatole France<sup>4</sup> in a biographical sketch which drew largely upon Job-Lazare for its facts. Much light, however, still remains to be thrown upon certain phases of Glatigny's career which his biographers have left either entirely untouched or shrouded in obscurity. Such, for example, is the period of his peregrinations as a strolling actor, his "Roman comique," as he himself styles it.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of this study is to discuss two matters of vital importance in Glatigny's career which his biographers have left untouched.

It is known that Glatigny, born in the Norman town of Lillebonne in 1839, fled from the printer's shop where he was serving an apprenticeship to become, at the age of only seventeen, *souffleur* to a troupe of strolling actors. It was at about this time that he heard the call of the Muses, although the sources differ as to the

<sup>1</sup> *La Légende du Parnasse contemporain*, Brussels, Brancart, 1884. The first of the four *conférences* comprising this volume is largely devoted to Glatigny.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the paragraph on Glatigny in Mendès' *Rapport sur le mouvement poétique français de 1867 à 1900*, Paris, Fasquelle, 1903, p. 121; his poem, *Pour Albert Glatigny, Poésies nouvelles*, Paris, Charpentier et Fasquelle, 1892; and especially his *Glatigny: Drame funambulesque en vers mêlé de chansons et de danses*, first produced at the Odéon, March 17, 1906, and published by Charpentier and Fasquelle in the same year.

<sup>3</sup> *Albert Glatigny, sa vie, son oeuvre*, Paris, Bécus, 1878, p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> *Notice* to the one-volume edition of Glatigny's *Poésies complètes*, Paris, Lemerre, 1879. See also *la Vie littéraire*, iv, 307-17, Paris, Lévy, 1900.

<sup>5</sup> *Gilles et pasquins, Poésies complètes*, p. 309. Cf. L. Labat, *Albert Glatigny: Six mois de bohème, Nouvelle revue*, lx, 568-79. This is an account of Glatigny's six-months sojourn in Bayonne, as member of the Hermant theatrical troupe, and contains many important documents.

instrument on which this call was sounded. Anatole France tells us that Glatigny had come fortuitously upon a volume of Ronsard in the attic of his father's house, had read it through eagerly, and had seen himself crowned with the aura of the poet.<sup>6</sup> Certain it is that Ronsard was one of Glatigny's guardian angels; in *A Ronsard*,<sup>7</sup> he speaks of him as "notre vieux maître," and in *Paresse*<sup>8</sup> he is "mon doux Ronsard." Job-Lazare, however, makes no mention of this Ronsard "find"; according to him, Glatigny during a visit to Alençon with the theatrical troupe of which he was a member, happened upon a copy of Banville's *Odes funambulesques*, and was so profoundly impressed by it that he wrote a poem in honor of Banville which he sent to Poulet-Malassiss, then editing the *Journal d'Alençon*. It is very unlikely that it was the *Odes funambulesques* which awakened Glatigny's poetic genius, since the latter's first collection of verse, *les Vignes folles*, was published only a short time after the appearance of Banville's volume, in 1857. Mendès' version is that during his theatrical pilgrimage Glatigny bought a copy of Banville's *Stalactites*, and was so dazzled by it that he was seized with the desire to acquaint himself with the masters of the world's poetry, a desire that led him to purchase a volume of Ronsard and to study Latin in order to read Vergil. In all probability, therefore, Glatigny's Ronsard story is to be credited; but it is also certain that he had fallen under the spell of Banville before he had taken many steps along the road to Parnassus.

That Glatigny was a disciple, perhaps the most brilliant disciple, of Banville is a commonplace among students of nineteenth century French poetry; his *Vignes folles* was dedicated "à mon cher et bien-aimé maître, Théodore de Banville," and his *Gilles et pasquins*<sup>9</sup> are patterned directly upon the *Odes funambulesques*. The influence of Banville is ubiquitous in the poetry of Glatigny. In *le Château romantique*,<sup>10</sup> dedicated to Banville, Glatigny exclaims:

<sup>6</sup> In a foot-note to p. x of his *Notice*, France says that he was told this by Hérédia, who had it from Glatigny.

<sup>7</sup> *Les Vignes folles, Poésies complètes*, p. 12.

<sup>8</sup> *Les Flèches d'or, Poésies complètes*, p. 114.

<sup>9</sup> Paris, Lemerre, 1871.

<sup>10</sup> *Les Flèches d'or, Poésies complètes*, p. 212.

Entré, cette saison dernière,  
 Dans le grand château, j'ai suivi  
 Fidèlement votre bannière,  
 Cher maître, et je vous ai servi.

And he goes on to declare: "Votre vie a guidé ma vie, Partout où vous alliez, j'allais." An amusing proof of Glatigny's "Banvillolatriy" is to be found in an incident related by Job-Lazare, according to which the actor-poet, during a stay in Belgium, engaged in a duel with one Albert Wolf because the latter had made some slurring remarks regarding Banville. It may not be beside the mark for us to see what Banville himself has to say about the accident which revealed to Glatigny his poetic vocation. In a passage from his *Anthologie des poètes français du XIXe siècle*, quoted by Mendès, he says:<sup>11</sup> "Cependant, comme les hasards arrivent toujours, les pérégrinations du comédien errant l'amènèrent à Alençon où Malassis, l'éditeur artiste qui à ce moment-là n'habitait pas encore Paris, lui donna un recueil de vers quelconque d'un poète contemporain. Chose inouïe et vraiment prodigieuse! après avoir dévoré, relu ce livre, par lequel il avait eu la révélation du vrai langage qu'il était destiné à parler, Glatigny fut du coup, immédiatement et tout de suite, l'admirable rimeur, l'étonnant forger de rythmes, l'ouvrier excellent victorieux de toutes les difficultés, l'ingénieux et subtil artiste . . ." Throughout Mendès' *Drame funambulesque*, the spirit of Banville hovers just above the stage, and one of the personages thinks to insult Glatigny by scornfully calling him "Banville," and by continuing: "Oui, jusqu'au jour d'aujourd'hui, As-tu fait un seul vers qui ne soit pas de lui?"<sup>12</sup> Glatigny himself makes a straightforward admission of his discipleship to Banville in the following strophe:<sup>13</sup>

O mes vers! on dira que j'imité Banville;  
 On aura bien raison si l'on ajoute encor  
 Que je l'ai copié d'une façon servile,  
 Que j'ai perdu l'haleine à souffler dans son cor.

The second point of interest in Glatigny's life that has not been

<sup>11</sup> In the *Dictionnaire bibliographique et critique* which serves as an appendix to the *Rapport sur le mouvement poétique*, p. 113.

<sup>12</sup> Spoken by Jean Morvieux in Act III.

<sup>13</sup> *Gilles et Pasquins: Epilogue, Poésies complètes*, p. 351.

clarified by his biographers is his connection with *le Parnasse contemporain*, an episode which, perhaps better than anything else in his life, reveals the paradoxical irony which constantly dogged his steps. According to the account given by Mendès in the first *conférence* of his *Légende*, Glatigny, during the course of his theatrical Odyssey, had met at Alençon Poulet-Malassis and Charles Asselineau, who, upon reading some of his verses, had advised him to try fortune in Paris. In the capital, Glatigny had had himself presented to Banville, Monselet, Jean du Boys, Charles Bataille, and others. From all he received encouragement, and it was with the help of Bataille that he published, in 1857, his *Vignes folles*. Two or three years later, when Catulle Mendès, *ætas* 19, arrived in Paris, with his pockets full of money and his head full of schemes for attaining literary glory, to found *la Revue fantaisiste*, Glatigny went to him, was immediately recognized as a genius, and became an *habitué* of the *bureau* of the new review. Mendès asserts that the group of poets usually referred to as the *Parnassiens* was also occasionally styled *les Impassibles*, a name derived from Glatigny's poem, *l'Impassible*.<sup>14</sup> This statement, however, is open to justifiable doubt; for, in the first place, Mendès declares that Glatigny had dedicated this poem to Gautier, whereas it is actually inscribed to Baudelaire; and, in the second place, the *Parnasse contemporain* for 1869 contains a sonnet by Gautier called *l'Impassible*<sup>15</sup> (whence, probably, the confusion in Mendès' mind). Moreover, the poem of Glatigny is of too specific a connotation to have justified the application of its name to an entire group of poets, while the term *impassible* had come to be regarded as synonymous with Leconte de Lisle long before 1866,<sup>16</sup> and might readily have been transferred from the great poet who was the unquestioned guide of the younger *Parnassiens* to the group itself. But whether or not Glatigny was responsible for the *Parnassiens*' having been dubbed *les Impassibles*, it is an amazing fact that Mendès, when he and Louis-Xavier de

<sup>14</sup> *Les Vignes folles, Poésies complètes*, p. 43.

<sup>15</sup> Written at Chamaranade, July, 1866 (*Poésies complètes*, Paris, Charpentier, 1884, vol. II, p. 240).

<sup>16</sup> The date of the publication, by Lemerre, of the first *Parnasse contemporain: Recueil de vers nouveaux*; two additional *recueils*, bearing the same title, were issued by Lemerre in 1869 and 1876, respectively.

Ricard undertook to edit the periodical which they called *le Parnasse contemporain*, did not publish a single verse by Glatigny, notwithstanding his exalted opinion of that poet. Moreover, it is noteworthy that Job-Lazare nowhere mentions Mendès or *la Revue fantaisiste* and that he takes only passing notice of *le Parnasse contemporain*, in connection with Glatigny's *Ballade des enfants sans souci*, and that, furthermore, Anatole France, himself a contributor to two of the three collections of *le Parnasse contemporain*, makes no reference to Glatigny's supposed friendship with Mendès or to his contributions to the two "journaux parnassiens" edited by that worthy. Most striking of all, however, is the fact that in the three fairly bulky tomes of *le Parnasse contemporain*, "recueils de vers nouveaux" which printed, together with representative verses of the principal poets of the day, the efforts of numerous poetasters whose names have since been completely forgotten, Glatigny is represented in only the second (in the editing of which Mendès' functions had been taken over in large measure by Banville) and there by a group of only four comparatively short poems.<sup>17</sup> If we are not, then, to discard Mendès' entire account of his sponsoring of Glatigny,<sup>18</sup> we must conclude either that he did not retain his admiration for the famished, scantily-clad poet who had so adorned the *bureau* of *la Revue fantaisiste* or that Glatigny's numerous and lengthy enforced absences from Paris caused him to be speedily forgotten by those who had previously pretended so keen an interest in his work. Be that as it may, the facts herein related will suffice to indicate that Glatigny was none too fortunate in his biographers, and that a definitive and scholarly account of his life remains to be written.

*The University of Texas.*

---

<sup>17</sup> *Ballade des enfants sans souci*, not included in any of Glatigny's three published collections of verse; *A un poète* (printed in *Gilles et pasquins* under the title of *A Sully Prudhomme*); *A Cosette*; and *A Alexandre de Bernay* (these last two also to be found in *Gilles et pasquins*).

<sup>18</sup> Remy de Gourmont has called Glatigny "le pivot du Parnasse" (*Promenades littéraires*, 5e série, 4th edition, Paris, *Mercurio de France*, 1913, p. 47). Brunetière, on the other hand, holds up to ridicule Mendès' statement that his first meeting with Glatigny in Paris marks the date of the birth of the *Parnasse* (*Histoire et littérature*, vol. II, Paris, Lévy, 1885, p. 208).



## NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

---

### TWO NOTES ON BLAKE

#### I

In Ellis and Yeats' *Poetical Works of William Blake*, occurs the following somewhat confusing passage:

The Eternal Man sleeps in the earth,  
nor feels the glorious sun  
Nor silent moon, nor all the hosts  
of heaven move in his body.

*Vala*, VIII, 500-501.

Remembering the important part played by mysticism in Blake's poetry, we should naturally look to the writings of other mystics for light on these lines, seemingly so little in harmony with biology or psychology. In *The Sense of the Infinite*, by L. O. Kuhns (p. 193) we find the following paragraph:

To Paracelsus, philosophy was the living mirror in which the world sees and understands its own image, it rests upon the harmony of the macrocosm and the microcosm. "And so the philosopher finds naught else in heaven or earth, but what he finds in man; nor finds aught in man, but what the heavens and earth themselves possess." As Emerson long afterward said, "What matters whether Orion is up yonder, or whether some God has hung it in the firmament of my brain," so Paracelsus cries out: "A man who knows the sun and the moon when his eyes are closed, he has the sun and moon in himself, such as they shine in the firmament of heaven."

#### II

In describing the slow creation of Urizen (the spirit of intellect) through successive "ages" and states "of dismal woe" Blake pictures as follows the first appearance of Urizen's gigantic spine:

In a horrible, dreamful slumber,  
Like the linked infernal chain,  
A vast Spine writh'd in torment  
Upon the winds, shooting pain'd  
Ribs, like a bending cavern.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Book of Urizen*, Chap. IV, stanza 6.

A vision curiously like this seems to have occurred to the New England transcendentalist and mystic, A. Bronson Alcott, a few years after Blake's death. In Mr. Harris's words:

I think Mr. Alcott has not preserved in written form the insights which he had at the time of his illumination. As he intimated to me, that period was one of such long-continued exaltation that his bodily strength gave way under it; and his visions of truth came to have mingled with them spectres which he perceived to be due to physical exhaustion. He saw the entire world as one vast spinal column. . . . He told me that when he had become almost deranged in his mind through this long-continued period of exaltation and insight into the spine as the type of all nature, and when he had begun to see spectres, his wife "packed him up and sent him down to visit Mr. Emerson." I therefore conceive this insight into the symbolic significance of the spine to be directly connected with his studies in Swedenborg.<sup>2</sup>

It is highly improbable that Alcott was influenced by Blake, who was, at that time, perhaps, the least read author in English history. Both may have owed some common debt to Swedenborg, only part of whose works I have read; but no such debt on Blake's part is mentioned in Mr. Damon's very thorough commentary. More probably the likeness is due to related psychological experiences such as frequently come to mystics who have never heard of each other.

FREDERICK E. PIERCE.

*Yale University.*

---

#### THE CRUX IN THE *PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE*

Dr. Magoun's article on *lof and grin* of the year 1137 in the *Peterborough Chronicle* is interesting as coming nearer a solution of the crux than any other yet proposed. Perhaps it is right to say that I had myself marked *lōf* in my *Toller-Bosworth* as having possible relation to the *Chronicle* passage, but had not been persuaded that it satisfied all requirements. Taking up the matter again in the light of this new note, I think Dr. Magoun's position may be considerably strengthened at least.

To begin with, Latin *redimiculum*, of which *lōf* is one of the

\* Quoted from *Studies in New England Transcendentalism* by H. C. Goddard, pp. 129-130.

glosses, though properly or more commonly meaning 'a band or fillet,' is also defined as 'necklace,' a meaning quite in keeping with its relation to *redimio* 'to bind round, encircle.' The word is also once used by Plautus (*Truc.* II, iv, 41, Lewis and Short, II, iv, 241) in immediate combination with *laqueus* as 'bond, fetter,' a meaning extended from that of 'ribbon used to tie the head-band or turban (*mitra*),' under the chin.<sup>1</sup> In the same way *mitra* 'head-band' came to be used in late Latin (*Tert. Carm. de Jona et Nineva* 42) for 'rope.'

Further than this, *redimicula* of the Gloss of Aldhelm (Napier, *OE. Glosses* 5241) is paralleled by OE. *wrædas*, *cynewiððan*, as well as *lōfas*. Now OE. *wræð*, the first word, means not only 'band, fillet,' but is glossed in its genitive plural as *fasciarum*, *vinculorum*, the latter implying a much stronger meaning as 'fetters, chains.'<sup>2</sup> In the fourth of the Exeter *Riddles*, too, *wræde* is united with *bende* and *clomme* 'band and chain or fetter.' If *wræð* had such stronger use, there is no reason to think *lōf* may not also have acquired a stronger than its original meaning.

Enough has been said to show that I would strengthen Dr. Magoun's interpretation by assuming for *lōf*, not 'fillet' or head-band' with reference to the *cnotted strenges* a little before, but 'necklace, circlet for the neck, neck-band, fetter,' which is immediately described in the *Chronicle* with such detail. There may have been some grim humor in calling the unusual instrument of torture *lōf and grin* 'a necklace and snare,' or the first may have been actually extended to 'neck-bond' as I have suggested above. At any rate we are clearly told that the *lōf and* were 'chain fetters' (*rachentēges*, itself a tautological compound and for emphasis) of an unusually heavy kind. They were used *abūton þe mannes throle and his heaf* 'around the man's ear 'neck-band' as Dr. Magoun suggests. The neck-band was then fastened to an *bēom* above, by a chain no doubt, making movement of any considerable sort impossible.

<sup>1</sup> See note to H. T. Riley's *Comedies of Plautus* II, 227, there to *Truc.* I, vi, and an unnumbered line.

<sup>2</sup> Napier gives only *fasciarum*, *wræda*, but Toller-Bosworth has both *fasciarum* and *vinculorum*, and Haupt (*Zeitschrift* ix, 488, 48) has clearly "fasciarum (gl. vinculorum), wræda."

To the suggestion of Dr. Magoun that *lōf* and *grin* are both plural neuters, I would point out that such an interpretation of the forms is improbable. The whole tendency of early Midland, as shown by the nouns of the *Peterborough Chronicle* passage from 1132 to 1154 inclusive, as in other early Midland writers, was for original neuters and feminines to appear in masculine forms, that is to assume the original masculine inflection. Thus in these entries—all in the hand of the last continuator—not only do all original masculine plurals have the *-es* ending, but all original feminines and five of the nine original neuters appear with the same inflectional form, only four original neuters having plurals without ending. If, therefore, *lōf* and *grin* had been intended as individual plurals, the first would have undoubtedly retained its masculine ending as *lōfes*, and the second would have more probably appeared in a similar form, *grines*.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

### JULIUS CAESAR AND OVID

Although Shakespeare was indebted to North's Plutarch for the account of the portents seen the night before the assassination of Julius Caesar, there seem to be some elements in Shakespeare's depiction which are related to Ovid's account of the change of Caesar into a star (Book XV, *Metamorphoses*). In support of this suggestion (which, I think, has not before been noted) I have ventured an arrangement of quotations from *Julius Caesar* to parallel a quotation from Ovid. Riley's translation (Bohn Library) has been used as a sufficiently neutral rendering.

— Ovid —

Venus—moved the Gods above. Although they were not able to frustrate the iron decrees of the aged sisters, yet they afforded no unerring tokens of approaching woe. They say, that arms resounding amid the black clouds, and dreadful blasts of the trumpet, and clarions heard through the heavens, forwarned men of the crime. The sad face of the sun gave a livid light to the alarmed earth. Often did torches seem to be burning in the midst of the stars; often did drops of blood fall in the showers. The azure-colored Lucifer had his light tinted with a dark iron

color, the chariot of the moon was besprinkled with blood. The Stygian owl gave omens of ill in a thousand places; in a thousand places did the ivory statues shed tears; dirges, too, are said to have been heard, and threatening expressions in the sacred groves. No victim gave an omen of good; the entrails, too, showed that great tumults were imminent—They say, too, that in the Forum, and around the houses and the temples of the Gods, the dogs were howling by night, and that the ghosts of the departed were walking, and that the city was shaken by earthquakes. But still the warnings of the Gods could not avert treachery and the approach of Fate. . . .

Jove (said to Venus), "change this soul, snatched from the murdered body, into a beam of light, that eternally the Deified Julius may look down from his lofty abode upon our Capitol and Forum." . . . Venus snatched the soul, just liberated from the body, away from the limbs of her own Caesar, and, not suffering it to dissolve in air, she bore it amid the stars of heaven. And as she bore it, she perceived it assume a train of light and become inflamed, . . . Above the moon it takes its flight, and, as a star, it glitters, carrying a flaming train with a lengthened track."

*Julius Caesar* (Tudor Edition)

Either there is civil strife in heaven (I, 3, 11).

When the most mighty gods by tokens send  
Such dreadful heralds to astonish us (I, 3, 55, 6).

Who ever knew the heavens menace so? (I, 3, 44).

Fierce fiery warriors fight upon the clouds,  
In ranks and squadrons and right form of war,  
Which drizzl'd blood upon the Capitol;  
The noise of battle hurtled in the air (II, 2, 19-22).

And the complexion of the element  
In favour's like the work we have in hand,  
Most bloody, fiery, and most terrible. (I, 3, 128-130).

And yesterday the bird of night did sit  
Even at noon-day upon the market-place,  
Hooting and shrieking. . . .

For, I believe, they are portentous things  
Unto the climate that they point upon. (I, 3, 26-28, 31-2) . . . . .  
*el romanzo*  
She dreamt to-night she saw my statuë,  
*iza, Favari,*  
Which, like a fountain with an hundred spouts,  
Did run pure blood (II, 2, 76-78).

What say the augurers? . . . . . able and Co.,

They would not have you to stir forth to-day, as and E. H. Wilkins,  
Plucking the entrails of an offering forth, . . . am indebted to Professor



## SCOTT, MANZONI, ROVANI

It is well known that Manzoni borrowed the idea of the historical novel from Walter Scott, who, in turn, imitated the *Promessi Sposi* (1827) in his *Fair Maid of Perth*<sup>1</sup> (1828). Several scholars have studied the relationship between Manzoni and Walter Scott.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the one who has done so most effectively is Maria Dotti, *Delle Derivazioni nei Promessi Sposi di Alessandro Manzoni dai romanzi di Walter Scott*, Pisa, Mariotti, 1900. After a careful examination of all possible derivations she comes to the conclusion that there are very few cases indeed of probable derivation, and almost none of verbal imitation, because, first of all, Manzoni was a genius of such caliber as not to need to borrow, and, in the second place because, though utterly familiar with Scott's materials and methods, he purposely refrained from copying either.

Given this situation, it is all the more peculiar to note an exact verbal parallel between these two novelists. In fact, in Chapter XIV of *Peaveril of the Peak* (1822)<sup>3</sup> we find the following sentence:

Flashes of enthusiasm, too, shot along his conversation, gleaming like the sheet-lightning of an autumn eve, which throws a strong, though momentary, illumination across the sober twilight, and all the surrounding objects, which, touched by it, assume a wilder and more striking character.

There seems to be an echo of this sentence in the first chapter of the *Promessi Sposi* where the author remarks:<sup>4</sup>

questo nome fu, nella mente di Don Abbondio, come, nel forte d'un tem-

<sup>1</sup> This was brought out by Francesco Torraca in his *Discussioni e ricerche letterarie*, Livorno, Vigo, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> Carducci suggested this study in his *Bozzetti e scherne*. See also Borgognoni in *La domenica letteraria*, anno V, no. 3; F. D'Ovidio, *Appunti per un parallelo fra Manzoni e Walter Scott*, in *Discussioni manzoniane*, Città di Castello, Lapi, 1886; P. Tedeschi, in *Natura ed arte*, May 1, 1897; G. Burgada, *Il Talismano di W. Scott e i Promessi Sposi*, in *Fanfulla della Domenica*, XXII (1900); G. Agnoli, *Gli albori del romanzo storico in Italia e i primi imitatori di Walter Scott*, Piacenza, Favari, 1906; the work by Torraca, mentioned in note 1, etc.

<sup>3</sup> In the edition of 1822, published by Archibald Constable and Co., Edinburgh, in four volumes, this passage occurs on p. 39 of Vol. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*, edited by J. Geddes and E. H. Wilkins, New York, Heath, 1911, p. 8. For this parallel I am indebted to Professor Wilkins.

porale notturno, un lampo che illumina momentaneamente e in confuso gli oggetti, e accresce il terrore.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, this parallel, which seems unquestionably a direct even if unintentional derivation, has not been pointed out.

The echo of this sentence, however, does not end with Manzoni, who, as we all know, had innumerable imitators, none of whom had his genius or, perhaps, his literary scruples. Giuseppe Rovani, who wrote in 1859-1860 his "romanzo ciclico" *I Cento anni*, in talking of one of his rogues says: <sup>5</sup>

Quel nome del lacchè Galantino fu per il marchese Recalcati come uno di quei lampi che, solcando di tratto il fitto bujo, lasciano vedere la posizione degli oggetti circostanti, tanto che uno che abbia smarrita la via, si raccapizza, ed esclama: Ora comprendo per qual parte si dee camminare.

In the Scott-Manzoni parallel we might note that the simile between a psychological state and a mood of nature is just the kind that Manzoni liked and developed superbly in his masterpiece. In the Manzoni-Rovani parallel there is more than verbal similarity (throughout his work Rovani's phraseology frequently imitates the sonorous simplicity of Manzoni), for there is even a parallelism of situation. In fact, in both cases these sentences refer to the sudden, flashlike enlightenment that comes upon a good man (Don Abbondio in the *Promessi Sposi* and the Marchese in *I Cento anni*) at the mere mention of the name of a notorious rascal (Don Rodrigo, primary villain in Manzoni's masterpiece, and Suardi, called il Galantino, arch-impostor in Rovani's story).

The actual imitation of Manzoni by his followers in the Italian historical novel has not yet been thoroughly studied. Agnoli <sup>6</sup> purposely omitted discussion of Manzoni and later Italian novelists. He even asserted, in his *Promessa*, that "l'imitazione pura Scottiana, in Italia, non va oltre il 1830"—a statement which seems hardly accurate, unless perhaps "pura" means direct, for it does not take into consideration, for instance, that Walter Scott may have been and doubtless was indirectly followed and imitated by Italian novelists through Manzoni, as in the case here presented.

*The University of Chicago.*

RUDOLPH ALTROCCHI.

<sup>5</sup> In Vol. I, p. 222, of the recent edition by the Istituto Editoriale Italiano, Vol. LXIX of the *Classici Italiani* edited by F. Martini.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*



# KING ÆLFRED'S INTERPRETATION OF EXODUS XXII, 18

As is well known, King Ælfred incorporated in the preface to his code of laws extracts from the scriptures, viz. the Ten Commandments with the two chapters from Exodus following them and a passage from the Acts of the Apostles. It has been pointed out by M. H. Turk in his edition of the Ælfredian Laws published by Ginn & Co., Boston, 1893, pp. 36-37, that the royal author indulged not only in omissions, but also in augmentations and alterations of his biblical text; however, with the exception of one instance, these alterations are reasonable and do not do violence to the import of the Latin. This one instance is the apparent misrendering of Exodus XXII, 18, *Maleficos non patieris vivere* by *Ða fæmnan þe gewuniað onfôn gealdorcræftigan and scinlæcan 7 wiccan ne læt þu ða libban*. Turk sees in that rendering a mistake he calls *strange* because "it puts *quam virgines accipere consueverunt*, belonging to the preceding ordinance, but not translated with it, before *maleficos*, thus gaining the utterly different meaning of *þa fæmnan þe gewuniað onfôn gealdorcræftigan . . . ne læt þu ða libban*, a peculiar and very severe injunction." F. Liebermann in his monumental edition of the Anglo-Saxon Laws, vol. III, 37b, believes the change is deliberate and explains it from the general tendency of Germanic Law to foist on women the crime of witchcraft. It seems to me Turk's view is nearer the truth than Liebermann's. I differ from Turk only insofar as I charge the 'strange mistake' not to Ælfred but to carelessness of some copyist who inserted *þe*<sup>1</sup> after instead of BEFORE *þa fæmnan*. Ælfred's rendering, then, *Gif hwa fæmnan beswice unbeweddode hire midslæpe, forgielða hie 7 hæbbe hie siððan him to wife. Gif ðære fæmnan fæder hie ðonne sellan nelle, agife he ðæt feoh æfter þam weotuman þe ða fæmnan gewuniað onfôn. || Gealdorcræftigan 7 scinlæcan wiccan ne læt þu ða libban* is quite in accord with the scriptural text of Exodus XXII, 16-18, *Si seduxerit quis virginem nondum desponsatam dormieritque cum ea: dotabit eam, et habebit*

<sup>1</sup> Omitted by the scribe of his archetypus, but probably placed on the margin with a reference mark to the word before which it was to be inserted.

*uxorem. Si pater virginis dare noluerit, reddet pecuniam juxta modum dotis, quam virgines accipere consueverunt. || Maleficos non patieris vivere.* Further proof of Ælfred not deviating here from his scriptural text is afforded by the agreement<sup>2</sup> of the Quadripartus translation with the Vulgate, dated 1114 by Liebermann.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Bristol, Conn.

---

### CORNELIUS AGRIPPA AND HENRY VAUGHAN

Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, soldier, physician, and reputed magician (1486-1535), is known to have exerted a profound influence upon Thomas Vaughan, Anglican clergyman and magician, the twin brother of the poet Henry Vaughan. Of Agrippa, Thomas Vaughan wrote, "He indeed is my author, and next to God I owe all that I have unto him,"<sup>1</sup> a statement that is substantiated by the many references in the works of Thomas to Agrippa's two most important books, *De Occulta Philosophia* and *De Incertitudine et Vanitate Scientiarum et Artium atque Excellentia Verbi Dei Declamatio*.

No one, I believe, has hitherto called attention to Henry's apparent familiarity with the second of the above-mentioned works of Agrippa. To me it seems clear that Henry Vaughan's curious little poem entitled *The Ass* was inspired, in part at least, by Chapter 102 of *The Vanity of Arts and Sciences* (to use the title of an English translation of 1684, from which I shall quote). Agrippa's *The Vanity of Arts and Sciences*, written about 1527, attacks ninety-nine aspects of worldly learning in as many chapters, and then in Chapter 100 concludes that the real key to knowledge and wisdom "is nothing else but the Word of God." Agrippa's book is really a plea for the simple, childlike acceptance of the doctrines of the Bible, of inspired truth.

In Chapter 101 Agrippa writes as follows:

Neither is there any sort of men less fit to receive Christian doctrine, than they who have their mindes tainted with the knowledge of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Owing to *Si* preceding the scribe omitted *se-* of *seduxerit*.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, ed. Waite, 1919, p. 50.

Sciences: for they are so stiff and obstinate in their self-opinions, that they leave no place for the Holy Ghost, and do so assure themselves, and trust in their own strength and power, that they will allow of nothing else for truth; and they scorn and despise all those things which they cannot understand by their own Industry. Therefore hath Christ *hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them to little children*; that is to say, to the poor in spirit, not enriched with the treasures of humane knowledge; to *the pure in heart*, not defil'd with the vanity of Opinions. . . . For this cause, Christ chose his Apostles not Scribes, not Doctors, not Priests, but unlearned persons of the vulgar people, void of knowledge, unskilful, and Asses.

Chapter 102 is entitled "A Digression in praise of the Ass." This chapter begins with the statement that, since some one might reproach him for calling the Apostles asses, it may be worth while "to discourse the Mysteries of the Ass." After discussing the traits of the ass and the veneration in which he has been held, he continues:

The Ass was consecrated by the touch of the body of Christ: for Christ ascending to *Jerusalem* in triumph for the Redemption of mankind, as it is recorded in the Gospel, rode upon an Ass; which was mysteriously foretold by the Oracle of *Zachary*. And we read that *Abraham* the Father of the Elect rode onely upon Asses. So that the Proverb commonly repeated among the Vulgar, is not spoken in vain, *That the Ass carries Mysteries*.<sup>2</sup> Wherefore I would hereby advertise the famous Professors of Sciences, that if the unprofitable burthen of Humane Knowledge be not laid aside, . . . whereby ye shall be turned into meer and bare Asses, that ye will be utterly and altogether unfit to carry the Mysteries of Divine wisdom.

The next chapter, entitled "The Conclusion of the Work," begins with the words "You therefore, O ye Asses, who are now with your children under the command of Christ," etc. These passages not only form a part of the climax of Agrippa's argument, but represent fairly the main idea his book was written to enforce, namely that the truth of religion is hidden from the wise and prudent, but revealed to little children.

Let us turn now to *Silex Scintillans*, Henry Vaughan's volume of religious verse. In Vaughan's poem *The Ass* occur these lines:

<sup>2</sup> *Asinus portat mysteria*. Brewer (*Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*) says: "A classical knock at the Roman clergy. The allusion is to the custom of employing asses to carry the cista which contained the sacred symbols, when processions were made through the streets."

Grant I may soft and lowly be,  
 And mind those things I cannot see;  
 Tie me to faith, though above reason;  
 Who question Power, they speak treason:  
 Let me, Thy ass, be only wise  
 To carry, not search, mysteries.  
 Who carries Thee, is by Thee led;  
 Who argues, follows his own head.

. . . . .  
 And when—O God! the ass is free,  
 In a state known to none but Thee,  
 O let him by his Lord be led  
 To living springs, and there be fed.

In his poem *Tears* Vaughan echoes the concluding thought of *The Ass*:

And when they all are fed, and have  
 Drunk of Thy living stream,  
 Bid Thy poor ass—with tears I crave!—  
 Drink after them.

In *Palm-Sunday* Vaughan writes:

I will be still a child, still meek  
 As the poor ass, which the proud jeer,  
 And only my dear Jesus seek.

In these passages, the first of which appears to have been inspired directly by Agrippa, the traits of meekness and humility, the attitude of innocent and trusting childhood are lauded. Elsewhere in Vaughan's religious verse the beauty of childhood is of course emphasized, notably in *The Retreat* and in *Childhood*. In the latter poem Vaughan writes:

If seeing much should make staid eyes,  
 And long experience should make wise;  
 Since all that age doth teach is ill,  
 Why should I not love childhood still?

Though Vaughan was not by nature a humble man, his poetry sets a high valuation on meekness, patience, and humility.

At the very least, it seems to me, my quotations from Agrippa point to the probable source of Vaughan's quaint use of the term *ass* as a synonym for the simple-minded Christian who is ready to accept the mysteries of religion without questioning. Is it unreasonable to go a step further and ask whether Cornelius Agrippa,

the spiritual teacher of Henry's twin brother, may not also have been the teacher, in some small measure, of Henry himself,<sup>3</sup> leading him to value more than he might otherwise have done the trustful, lowly attitude of a little child?

ALEXANDER C. JUDSON.

*Indiana University.*

### USE OF *DE* BEFORE *ENDROIT* IN OLD FRENCH

In his edition of *Le Lai de l'Ombre*, Paris, 1913, p. xi, Bédier says: "Pour notre part nous croyons fermement que les auteurs de l'*Escoufle*, de *Guillaume de Dôle* et du *Lai de l'Ombre* s'appellent tous trois Jean Renart." One of the passages cited in support of this statement is the following:

Cil bel mot plesant et poli  
Le font en un penssé cheir  
D'endroit ce qu'ele veut oïr  
Sa requeste, s'en ot pitié,  
Quar ne tint a point de faintié  
Les souspirs, les lermes qu'il pleure.

(*Le Lai de l'Ombre*, ll. 546-552).

In connection with the quotation just given, the editor says: "Cet emploi de *de* avant la préposition *endroit* a été rencontré par Godefroy<sup>1</sup> dans une charte datée de 1271. Mussafia en a trouvé dans *Guillaume de Dôle* un troisième exemple: *d'endroit* ceste chose (v. 2817). Personne, croyons nous, n'en a pas relevé un quatrième."

The purpose of this note is to call attention to four additional examples of *d'endroit*:

*D'endroit* de vos le tieg je a folaje  
Qui atendez part en mon eritage.

(*Les Narbonnais*, ed. by Hermann Suchier,

Paris, 1898, ll. 162-3).

<sup>3</sup> As L. I. Guiney has pointed out, Henry Vaughan's allusion in his prose treatise *Man in Darkness* to "a great philosopher and secretary to nature" apparently refers to Cornelius Agrippa (cf. Martin's ed. of *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, I, 176, and note).

<sup>1</sup> Cum discorde fust entre . . . *d'endroit* de la grange de Viel Moustier. (1271, *Compromis*, Lebeuf, *Preuv. de l'Hist. d'Auvergne*.)

Mès se des autres puet son cors delivrer,  
*D'androit* de vos le cuit bien aquiter.

(*Aymeri de Narbonne*, ed. by Louis Demaison,  
 Paris, 1887, ll. 4052-3).

Se vous creés le droit conseil  
*D'endroit* moi pour vous, vous conseil  
 Que vous del tout le voeliés croire.

(Beaumanoir, *Salu d'Amours*, ll. 315-17,  
*Oeuvres Poétiques de Beaumanoir*, II, ed. by  
 Suchier, Paris, 1885).

*D'endroit* moi voel qu'il soit desfais.

(Beaumanoir, *op. cit.*, l. 383).

The examples cited above show that the construction under consideration was not as rare as Bédier has supposed. The fact that it occurs in *Le Lai de l'Ombre* and in *Guillaume de Dôle* is therefore of very slight value as an argument supporting the statement that both poems were written by the same author.

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

#### A NOTE ON THE SPANISH OCTOSYLLABLE

My recent edition of the Spanish play *Ya anda la de Mazagatos* (*Bull. hisp.*, 1923-1924) received in the *Revista de filología española* (1924, XI, 321-323) a notice which was in many respects too indulgent. There are, however, a few points of versification brought up by the reviewer on which I must differ from him, and since they involve certain general principles, it appears worth while to note them here, as briefly as possible.

They all concern the Spanish octosyllabic line. Twice the reviewer speaks of a rhythmic accent on the fourth syllable, which permits hiatus before it. The lines, as he would read them, are:

v. 1470 ¡Qué Rica | es! A la trena

v. 1483 digo que | antes de aorcalle

Now, the text of this play is not so perfect that one might not simply say the lines are faulty, and let that suffice. But I do not like to let pass without a protest the theory that the octosylla-

ble has an internal rhythmic accent, like a hendecasyllable. A "rhythmic accent," what Benot calls a "sílabas constituyente," is an accent of fixed position in the line, or which shifts its place only in accordance with certain well-recognized laws.<sup>1</sup> The octosyllable has only one rhythmic accent, on syllable 7. In this statement all the treatises concur, from Díaz Rengifo, through Bello and Benot, down to the genial Bolivian iconoclast Jaimes Freyre; and my own study of this line in autograph mss. confirms the opinion.<sup>2</sup> It is possible that in the lines cited there may be hiati before a mere word-accent; such are found, tho they are quite exceptional. Let us not, however, invoke a "rhythmic accent" to explain them.<sup>3</sup>

Very similar is the statement that in v. 1481

un buen día, | e de aorcarte

(the scansion is the reviewer's) the hiatus is explained by "la pausa entre hemistiquios." It would be necessary first to prove that an octosyllable is divided into hemistichs like an alexandrine, a thing quite impossible, to my notion, for the reasons I have just given. The octosyllable has neither hemistichs nor internal rhythmic accent. The burden of proof is on the affirmative!<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I am aware that the term "acento rítmico" is sometimes used in Spanish in the sense of what we call a simple "word-accent," and it is possible that that was what the reviewer intended. But, if so, the "acento tónico" is in itself no sufficient explanation of a preceding hiatus, whereas a real rhythmic accent is.

<sup>2</sup> I shall quote only the first and last of the important *tratadistas*. Díaz Rengifo, *Arte poética española*, 1644, cap. ix: "El verso de Redondilla mayor se compone de ocho sílabas; de las quales la septima será siempre larga, y la octava breue," etc. "Y aduertase, que quando dezimos, que el verso puede llevar vna, ò dos, ò tres, ò quatro sílabas largas [besides the seventh], pueden ser qualesquiera de las seys."

Ricardo Jaimes Freyre, *Leyes de la versificación castellana*, 2d ed., La Paz, 1919, p. 31: "Este verso [the octosyllable] está compuesto de ocho sílabas; tienen acento la primera, la segunda y la séptima, pero el único necesario es el de la séptima; sin él no habría verso, y sí lo habría suprimiendo los demás o llevándolos a otras sílabas."

<sup>3</sup> I recently made a study of the metrics of five autograph plays of Lope de Vega, and found a total of eighteen cases of hiatus in the combination atonic-tonic, where neither aspirate *h* nor rhythmic accent came into play. The entire investigation will, I trust, appear before long.

<sup>4</sup> I am speaking in this article only of the common octosyllable which

The third and last point concerns the question of *enjambement* between lines—a question on which Professor Espinosa has announced an article in the *Romanic Review* that should illuminate the subject.<sup>5</sup> The reviewer would by that means explain a line which appears to have two superfluous syllables:

Con la confusion logré  
escaparme, y perdida la senda (2404-2405)

By reading “logré-escaparme,” the difficulty is avoided, but a greater one is raised. If such *enjambement* existed in the seventeenth century, one ought to be able to produce corroborative cases in plenty. No one has done so; and once more, ¡*vengan pruebas!*

I would readily admit that in reading these lines one can pass two syllables from the second to the first without offense to the ear. But that fact scarcely touches the case. It is necessary to state and emphasize a principle too often overlooked: that *metrical laws, tho having their origin in speech laws, do not always coincide with them now*. The most common proof is the fact that the rules of synalepha are not the same as those of syneresis; we have *la era*, but *maestro*. Another frequent occurrence is synalepha between the speeches of different persons. Thus:

Laurencio	¿Tu pensamiento?	
Finea		Si.
Laur.		En ti.

Lope de Vega, *La Dama boba*, v. 1721.

Or

Finea	Buelbome a boba.	
Laur.		Eso ynporta.

*Ibid.*, v. 2656.

Here is metrical synalepha, but it would be hard to conceive real phonetic speech-synalepha between separate speakers.

The mere indication of this truth must suffice now, without elaboration.

*University of California.*

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY.

---

forms the unit of *redondillas*, *quintillas*, *décimas*, and *romance* verse. One does sometimes find a lyric or musical octosyllable which is, intentionally and exceptionally, divided in even halves.

<sup>5</sup> Since this note was written, two of these articles have appeared, and a third is announced. So far they do not seem conclusive with regard to the particular point involved here.



E. BERGERAT'S "RAMOUKI LE CASSEUR DE  
PIERRES."

An attractive apologue by Emile Bergerat, entitled "Ramouki le casseur de pierres, conte japonais" will be found in R. Michaud's *Conteurs français d'aujourd'hui*.<sup>1</sup> Through the success of Professor Michaud's excellent text-book, Bergerat's story has had a circulation in the United States which justifies some tardy comment upon its presentation of Japanese customs, a matter of importance to Americans.

"Un bonze japonais, bouddhiste, m'a conté la jolie légende que voici," said Bergerat in his first sentence, which was not meant to be believed. He then tells of a discontented stone-breaker named Ramouki, who lived on the road from Yokohama to Kamakura by selling rounded stones to pilgrims. They would throw these stones at idols thinking that if the stones found a lodgment on them their prayers were granted. Because Ramouki is envious of a rich man who passed by, a serving-maid advised him to pray to Buddha who transformed him instantly into the object of his envy. In his new form, Ramouki became jealous of the Mikado who passed that way with a galloping guard, and he immediately became the Mikado. But it seemed finer to be Fusi-Yama than to be the Mikado, and he was turned into the mountain. Next, he was too hot under the burning sun, and was turned into a cool cloud which grew into a cloud-burst and a wind. Then he saw a rock resisting the storm, with a "mousmé"<sup>2</sup> seated upon it, but when he wished to be the rock on which the girl was resting, she handed him back his hammer, and he returned to stone-breaking cured of dreams.

The parallel to this story is found in the Dutch story *Max Haveelaar* (1860) by a resident of Java, Edward Douwes Dekker (1820-1887). Aimé Humbert inserted in his *Japon illustré*<sup>3</sup> a transla-

<sup>1</sup> D. C. Heath & Co., 1923, pp. 16-19, reprinted from *Trente-six contes de toutes les couleurs*, Paris, 1919.

<sup>2</sup> This word, generally transcribed *musume*, only means "daughter" or "jeune fille" in Japanese.

<sup>3</sup> 2 vols., 4°, Paris, Hachette, 1870. See Vol. II, chap. xxxiv, "Contes japonais." Here the pseudo-Japanese story is quoted after two genuine

tion of a pseudo-Japanese episode from *Max Havelaar* entitled "Le Tailleur de pierres," to support his claim that the contact of the literary genius of the West with the civilization of the Far East would be fruitful. If Bergerat knew Humbert's book, which used to be the best compendium of knowledge concerning the Japanese, he would probably have read the chapter of "Contes japonais."

What is the plot of the Dutch-Japanese story, whose title so much resembles Bergerat's "Casseur de pierres?" "Le tailleur de pierres" was an un-named discontented quarryman. His wish to be rich enough to enjoy fine clothing, comfort and leisure was granted by an angel, but he remained dissatisfied. Seeing the emperor pass, he coveted his position, and was made the emperor, but was soon changed into the sun because it had power over emperors, and then he became the cloud that cut off the sun's rays, and the rock that resisted the rain-cloud. But as a rock he found himself at the mercy of a stone-cutter, which taught him to be satisfied with his own place.

Comparing the two stories, Bergerat's "Casseur de pierres" is said to make a living by selling stones to pilgrims, although stones are too common in Japan to be saleable.<sup>4</sup> He is envious of a "riche bourgeois corpulent, emporté par deux jeunes djinrikis,"<sup>5</sup> and of the Mikado, whose name is used only by Bergerat. His

Japanese fairy-tales. Humbert was the first diplomatic representative of Switzerland in Japan.

<sup>4</sup> An account of many Japanese religious practices will be found in my monograph; "The Great Shrine of Idzumo," *Trans. Asiatic Soc. of Japan*, Vol. XLI, Pt. IV, 1913.

<sup>5</sup> *Contes français d'aujourd'hui*, p. 17, l. 2, and note, p. 134. The Japanese word usually transcribed *jinrikisha* means man-power-vehicle, a two wheeled vehicle drawn by a man who is sometimes assisted by another runner. These pullers are called *kurumaya*, carriage-men, by the Japanese. In *Things Japanese*, 5th ed., p. 265, Chamberlain says: "The poor word *jinrikisha* suffers many things at the hands of Japanese and foreigners alike. The Japanese generally cut off its tail and call it *jinriki*, or else, they translate the Chinese syllable *sha* into their own language, and call it *kuruma*. The English cut off its head and maltreat the vowels, pronouncing it *rickshaw*."

<sup>6</sup> Of Fuji, Chamberlain says, *op. cit.*: "Philology is the science that can tell us least; for no consensus of opinion has yet been reached as to

stone-breaker becomes Fusi-yama<sup>6</sup> instead of turning into the sun. Besides this, he has the "Japanese" name of Ramouki.

However "Ramouki" is not Japanese.<sup>7</sup> My hypothesis is that Bergerat also consulted Emile Guimet's *Promenades japonaises*,<sup>8</sup> which describes a trip by land from Yokohama to Kamakura, and found a mention here of "ranouki" the badger, as a servant of the god Inari.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately "ranouki" is a misprint for *tanuki*, the real word for badger. Thus the name Ramouki is only a corruption of a misprint.

Other evidence that Bergerat knew Guimet's *Promenades japonaises* can be given. Guimet describes a trip to Kamakura by road, Humbert by water. The former describes the Japanese custom of trying one's fortune by tossing a stone at an idol, which Humbert does not mention.<sup>10</sup> Guimet employed two coolies to pull each rickshaw used by his party,<sup>11</sup> which perhaps suggested the phrase "emporté par deux jeunes djinrikis," quoted above.

Bergerat especially misrepresents the Japanese when Ramouki expresses the wish to be the Mikado. Dekker's stone-cutter expressed the same thought, though this is surely contrary to the "entirely reverential and distant" attitude of men's minds in Japan.<sup>12</sup> Bergerat committed an anachronism in describing a

the origin of the name of *Fuji*—anciently *Fuzi* or *Fuzhi*. *Fuji-san*, the current popular name, simply means 'Mount Fuji,' *san* being Chinese for 'mountain.' *Fuji-no-yama*, the form preferred in poetry, means "the mountain of Fuji" in pure Japanese; and the Europeanized form *Fusiyama* is a corruption of this latter."

<sup>7</sup> Inouye's *Jap.-Eng. Dictionary*, 1908, lists only eleven Japanese words beginning with an initial character pronounced *ra*.

<sup>8</sup> Paris, 1878, ill. by F. Régamey. E. Guimet was the founder of the museum of religions that bears his name in Paris. He went around the world in the seventies with a government "mission" for the study of religions.

<sup>9</sup> *Promenades*, p. 44.

<sup>10</sup> *Promenades*, p. 170: "La plupart (des statues) sont recouvertes de petites pierres que les fidèles jettent dessus; si la pierre reste en place, c'est un indice que la prière est acceptée; si la pierre tombe, c'est un mauvais présage."

<sup>11</sup> *Promenades*, p. 58 and *passim*.

<sup>12</sup> See Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, art. "Mikado." "The etymology of the word *Mikado* is not quite clear. Some . . . trace it to *mi*,

rich Japanese as "habillé de pierreries sonnantes et prismatiques,"<sup>13</sup> since jewels were only worn by the ancient Japanese. It is also an anachronism to have the Mikado travel in a palanquin of gold, "voilé à tous les regards . . . à travers les fronts prosternés"<sup>14</sup> in the days of rickshaws, invented in the seventies. Need I say in conclusion that all imaginative literary interpretations of the Far East should at first be regarded with suspicion?<sup>15</sup>

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

*Stanford University.*

## ZUM FUGENVOKAL IN WESTGERMANISCHEN KOMPOSITIS

### I

*Ahd.* got-a-weppi, *as.* god-o-webbi, *ags.* god-(e)-web, *usw.* 'kostbares Gewebe.'

Im *Ahd.* liegen die Formen *got-a-*, *got-o-*, *got-u-*, *got-i-*, *got-e-weppi* vor (vgl. O. Gröger, *Die ahd. und as. Kompositions-fuge*, 1910, Wörterverzeichnis, S. 335). Nach Gröger (§ 46. 1b, S. 86) soll aber der Fugenvokal -o- vorherrschen.

Im *As.* liegen die Formen *god-o-*, *god-u-*, *god-e-webbi* (vgl. Gröger, § 46. 1b, S. 85) vor. Sowie im *Ahd.* herrscht auch im *As.* der Fugenvokal -o- (aber in noch höherem Grade als im *Ahd.*) vor. Im *Heliand* begegnen nur die Formen *god-o-*, *god-u-webbi*; die Form *god-e-webbi* ist viel seltener belegt und zwar nur in den Glossen.

Über die vorherrschende Form *as. god-o-webbi*: *ahd. got-o-weppi*

'august,' and *kado*, a 'gate,' reminding one of the 'Sublime Porte' of Turkey."

<sup>13</sup> *Conteurs*, p. 17, l. 4. The *magatama* or "curved-jewels" of the ancient Japanese are illustrated by Humbert, *Japon illustré*, Vol. I, p. 145, where they are called "pierreries."

<sup>14</sup> *Conteurs*, p. 17, l. 30.

<sup>15</sup> For instance, Maurice Magre's "féerie chinoise" *Sin*, acted by Gémier in 1921 at the Fémina theater, takes place 2000 years ago at Nankin, although this name was first given to the city in 1368. Magre also alluded to the "pousse-pousse" or rickshaw (*Sin*, p. 18: "Le long des remparts on vont les pousse-pousse.")

mit dem Fugenvokal *-o-* äussert sich Gröger (§ 46. 1b, S. 85-86) folgendermassen: "Es scheint aber nicht ausgeschlossen, dass man es in *godobeddi* pulvinar und *godowebbi* sericum, die auch ahd. regelmässig mit Fugenvokal erscheinen, sowie in dem nach der Analogie von *godobeddi* gebildeten und ihm bedeutungsverwandten *godorasta* pulvinar, mit Gen.-plur.-Compositis zu tun hat (vgl. auch *afgodohūs*, § 17. II. 3 f.), eine Annahme, die dadurch an Wahrscheinlichkeit gewinnt, dass ahd. wie as. der Fugenvokal meistens als *o* erscheint (vgl. aber über *o* vor Labial § 31. 1b, durch Assimilation § 31. 1a)."

Ich glaube, dass diese Vermutung Grögers richtig ist. Da das As. den Fugenvokal *-a-* nach kurzer Silbe nur selten (und zwar sonst niemals nach Verschlusslauten, vgl. Gröger, § 45, S. 84), das Ahd. hingegen ihn fast durchweg bewahrt, so wird man wohl den Fugenvokal *-o-* in as. *god-o-webbi* von dem Fugenvokal *-o-* in ahd. *got-o-weppi* trennen müssen.

Im Ahd. begegnen alle möglichen Schwankungen des ursprünglichen Fugenvokals *-a-*, d. h. *-o-*, *-u-*, *-i-*, *-e-*. Das *-o-* in *got-o-weppi* liesse sich also aus *got-a-weppi* entweder durch den Einfluss des folgenden Labials *-w* oder durch Assimilation an den Vokal *o* der vorhergehenden Silbe erklären.

Ganz anders aber steht die Sache im As. Der gänzliche Mangel des ursprünglichen Fugenvokals *-a-* und der fast durchweg herrschende Fugenvokal *-o-* (*-u-*) deuten darauf hin, dass der Fugenvokal *-o-* in *god-o-webbi* nicht, wie in ahd. *got-o-weppi*, auf ein ursprüngliches *-a-* zurückgeht, sondern sekundären Ursprungs sein muss.

Dass wir in as. *god-o-webbi* ein Gen.-plur.-Kompositum haben, halte ich mit Gröger (§ 46. 1b) für wahrscheinlich. Der Form *god-o-webbi* stehen aber nicht nur die mit *god-o-* gebildeten Komposita, wie *god-o-beddi*, *god-o-rasta*, *afgod-o-hūs* (welche Gröger hier anführt), sondern auch die mit den bedeutungsverwandten *regan-*, *metod-* gebildeten Komposita zur Seite, wie z. B. *regan-o-giskapu*, *metod-o-giskapu*. Der Fugenvokal *-e-* der seltneren Form *god-e-webbi* liesse sich dann als Schwankung eines älteren *-o-* erklären.

Im Ags. kommt das betreffende Kompositum *ohne* und *mit* Fugenvokal vor, also *god-web* und *god-e-web*. Da das Ags. den Fugenvokal (west-germ.) *-a-* nach kurzer Silbe regelrecht schwinden

lässt (vgl. Bulbring, *Ags. Elementarb.*, § 397), so werden wir wohl annehmen müssen, dass auch hier die Form *god-web* (=afries. *god-wob*) lautgerecht ist, und dass sie daher, ebenso wie ahd. *got-a-weppi*, das eigentliche Kompositum darstellt. Demnach müsste die ags. Form *god-e-web*<sup>1</sup> (mit Fugenvokal) eine sekundäre Entwicklung darstellen, die mit as. *god-o-webbi* als Gen.-plur.-Kompositum auf eine Linie zu stellen ist. Der ags. Fugenvokal *-e-* liesse sich dann (wohl im Anschluss an den häufig erscheinenden Fugenvokal *-e-*) aus einem *-a-* des Gen. plur. (*god-a-*) erklären.

## II

*Westgerm.* \*gunþ: ahd. gund-fano, as. gûð-hamo, ags. gûð-fana, usw.

Wenn dem westgerm. \*gunþ- als erstem Glied eines Kompositums ein \*gunþ-jô der jô-Flexion zu grunde liegt, wie herkömmlich angenommen wird (vgl. Fick, *Vergl. Wb. der indo-german. Sprachen*<sup>4</sup>, S. 124, *gunþiô*), so bleibt der fast durchweg begegnende Mangel des Fugenvokals in sämtlichen westgerm. Sprachen kaum erklärlich, da hier das *-j-* der Suffixsilbe sonst als Fugenvokal (*-i-*: *-e-*) regelrecht bewahrt wird.

Im As. (vgl. Gröger, § 66. 1, S. 111) und im Ags. liegen keine Beispiele von gûð- mit Fugenvokal vor; nur im Ahd. begegnen Formen mit Fugenvokal, aber verhältnismässig selten gegenüber den Formen ohne Fugenvokal (vgl. Gröger, § 147. a, S. 252-254).

Im selbständigen Gebrauch kommt dieses Wort nicht nur als jô-Stamm in as. *gûðea* (vgl. an. *gunnr*: *guðr*), sondern auch als ô-Stamm in ags. *gûð* vor. Wäre ags. *gûð* ein ursprünglicher jô-Stamm gewesen, der in die ô-Flexion übergetreten war, so hätte man statt *gûð* eine Form \*gÿð mit i-Umlaut erwartet (vgl. ÿð = as. *ûðea*, an. *unnr*: *uðr* 'Woge'). Ags. *gûð* (ô-Stamm) neben as. *gûðea* deutet darauf hin, dass im Urwestgerm. ein \*gunþ-ô neben \*gunþ-jô gestanden hat,<sup>2</sup> eine Annahme, die durch die fugenvokallosten Formen der Komposita im Westgerm. gestützt wird.

Für die fugenvokallosten Formen der Komposita im Westgerm. (also durchweg im As. und im Ags.) wird man wohl ein \*gunþ-ô

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. auch *god-e-gyld* = eigentlich 'der Götter Zahlung'; 'idolum,' 'Götze.'

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. auch Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik* I, § 319, der für ahd. *gund-* in Kompositis ein \**gunda* neben \**gundia* voraussetzt.

(> ags. *gûð*) ansetzen müssen. Möglich ist es zwar, dass die fugenvokallosten Formen aus einem alten Nom. *\*gunþ-i* der *jô*-Flexion (vgl. Gröger, § 56. 2, S. 95; § 147. a, S. 255) stammen. Bei den *jô*-Stämmen aber herrschen sonst überall die Formen mit Fugenvokal in überwiegender Anzahl vor, während die *fugenvokallosten* Formen (namentlich im Ahd. und im As.) verhältnismässig selten sind <sup>3</sup> (vgl. Gröger, § 56. 1, 2, S. 93-95; § 147. a, S. 254). Die umgekehrten Verhältnisse bei *\*gunþ-* in Kompositis stimmen also nicht mit der Annahme eines ursprünglichen *\*gunþ-jô* überein; daher wird es nicht nötig sein, die fugenvokallosten Formen aus einem Nom. *\*gunþ-i* > *\*gunþ-* zu erklären.

Die ahd. Beispiele mit Fugenvokal, namentlich Personennamen wie *Gund-i-bert*, *Gund-e-rîh*, *Gunt-a-swind*, *Gund-o-bert*, *Gund-u-roh* (vgl. Gröger, § 147. a, S. 253) zeigen alle möglichen Schwankungen des Fugenvokals. Aus der Qualität des hier erscheinenden Vokals lassen sich aber auf den *ursprünglichen* (d. h. ahd.) Fugenvokal keine sicheren Schlüsse ziehen. Am wahrscheinlichsten scheint es mir, dass wir hier mit *zwei* zu grunde liegenden Fugenvokalen zu tun haben, nämlich dem *-i-* der *jô*-Flexion und dem *-a-* <sup>4</sup> der *ô*-Flexion (d. h. durch Anschluss an einen Nom. *\*gunt-a-*). Letztere Bildung wäre aber sekundären (d. h. ahd.) Ursprungs und kommt also bei der Frage nach der ursprünglich westgerm. Form des Wortes in Kompositis nicht in Betracht. Wenn weiter der ahd. Fugenvokal auch Schwankungen eines älteren *-i-* darstellt, so ist es jedoch nicht sicher, dass dieses *-i-* ursprünglich (d. h. gemeinwestgerm. Ursprungs) ist, denn angesichts der überwiegenden Anzahl der Fälle von *\*gunþ-* in Kompositis *ohne* Fugenvokal dürfte man dieses *-i-* als sekundär (d. h. teils als phonetisch entwickelt, vgl. Gröger, § 147. a, S. 254, oder teils als analo-

<sup>3</sup> Im Ags. begegnen etwas häufiger als im Ahd. und im As. Formen der *jô*-Flexion ohne Fugenvokal, wohl weil im Ags. der Nom. sg. der *jô*-Flexion schon *ohne Endung* vorlag, vgl. *hild* Nom., wonach *hild-freca*, *hild-fruma*, usw. gegenüber den eigentlichen Kompositis mit Fugenvokal wie *hild-e-rinc*, *hild-e-bil*, usw.

<sup>4</sup> Dieses *-a-* könnte ja auch Schwankung (durch Assimilation hervorgerufen) eines älteren *-i-* darstellen, wenn das zweite Glied ein *-a-* enthält, wie z. B. in *Gund-a-ram*, *Gund-a-lah*, *Gund-a-rât*, usw. Sonst (wie z. B. in *Gunt-a-swint*) aber geben die Laute der Nachbarsilben keinen Anlass zum Schwanken *i* > *a*, weshalb das *-a-* hier als der ursprüngliche ahd. Vokal aufzufassen ist.

gischen Fugenvokal nach dem Muster des gleichbedeutenden *hilt-i*) auffassen.

Diese Annahme des sekundären Ursprungs des ahd. Fugenvokals gewinnt an Wahrscheinlichkeit, wenn man die Tatsache in Betracht zieht, dass die ahd. Komposita mit Fugenvokal überhaupt nicht in den ältesten Quellen vorliegen und auch später gegen Formen mit Fugenvokal zurücktreten (vgl. Gröger, § 151, S. 260). Wenn weiter das Ahd. Abweichungen (und zwar in verhältnismässig geringem Masse) von den übrigen westgerm. Sprachen zeigt, so ist es viel wahrscheinlicher, dass diese Abweichungen sekundären Ursprungs sind, als dass sie die ursprüngliche Bildungsweise darstellen. Es sei hier bemerkt, dass weder das As. noch das Ags. Beispiele von *\*gunþ-* mit Fugenvokal aufweist.

Die Erklärung der ahd. Formen mit Fugenvokal als uneigentlicher Komposita empfiehlt sich weiter dadurch, dass hierbei das Westgerm. eine Einheitlichkeit gewinnt, indem in diesem Falle ein ursprüngliches *\*gunþ-ô* in Kompositis für sämtliche westgerm. Sprachen anzusetzen wäre.

Lehrreich sind schliesslich bei der Frage nach der ursprünglichen Gestaltung des *\*gunþ-* in westgerm. Kompositis die Verhältnisse im Altnordischen. Hier liegt nämlich *gunnr: guðr* der *jô*-Flexion in Kompositis niemals mit Fugenvokal vor, trotzdem die *jô*-Stämme sonst im An., gerade wie im Westgerm., regelrecht den Fugenvokal (*-i: -e-*) aufweisen, vgl. z. B. *gunn-fani* (= ahd. *gund-fano*, as. *gût-fano*, Gröger, § 66. 1, S. 111, ags. *gûð-fana*), *gunn-logi*, *Gunn-björn*, usw. gegenüber *hildr*, *jô*-Flexion, durchweg mit Fugenvokal, also *hild-i-meðr* (vgl. ahd. *hilt-i-scalh*, as. *hild-i-skalk*, ags. *hild-e-rinc*), *Hild-i-björn*, usw.

Die Verhältnisse im An. weisen also, ebenso wie im Westgerm., auf ein ursprüngliches *\*gunþ-ô* der *ô*-Flexion in Kompositis hin. Der gänzliche Mangel des Fugenvokals in den an. Kompositis schliesst die Annahme aus, dass hier ein *\*gunþ-jô* der *jô*-Flexion neben *\*gunþ-ô* hätte stehen können, wie dies auf Grund des im Ahd. erscheinenden Fugenvokals für das Westgerm. angenommen werden darf. Die fugenvokallosten Formen der Komposita im An. und in Westgerm. weisen auf ein gemeinnord.-westgerm. *\*gunþ-ô* hin; woraus zu erschliessen ist, dass die ahd. Formen mit Fugenvokal sekundären Ursprungs sind und daher uneigentliche Komposita darstellen.



Liegt somit dem \**gunþ-* in den eigentlichen Kompositis des Nord.- und Westgerm. ein \**gunþ-ô* der *ô*-Flexion zu grunde, so erscheint dagegen die *jô*-Flexion des Wortes beim selbständigen Gebrauch (vgl. as. *gûðea*, an. *gunnr: guðr*) sowie vielleicht auch in den ahd. uneigentlichen Kompositis (mit Fugenvokal).

Diese Verhältnisse weisen auf die Möglichkeit hin, das die *jô*-Flexion dieses Wortes späteren Ursprungs ist als die *ô*-Flexion. Bei den eigentlichen Kompositis scheint das Wort in seiner ursprünglichen Flexion (d. h. *ô*-Stamm) behandelt zu werden, während beim selbständigen Gebrauch an Übertritt aus der ursprünglichen *ô*-Flexion in die *jô*-Flexion (vielleicht unter dem Einfluss des gleichbedeutenden \**hild-jô*) zu denken ist. Ob dieser Vorgang sich schon in urwestgerm.-urnord. Zeit vollzogen hatte oder als erst einzelsprachlich zu betrachten ist, lässt sich schwer entscheiden.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

*University of Kansas.*

#### NOTE ON JOHN LYLY'S *MIDAS*

In John Lyly's *Midas*, iv, 4, 48, Sophronia quotes a Latin line,

Uno namque modo Pan et Apollo nocent.

This is probably adapted from what George Chapman called "~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~poet~~ <sup>poet</sup> ~~gil's~~ <sup>gil's</sup> Epigram of Wine and Women,"

Nec Veneris nec tu vini tenearis amore;

Uno namque modo vina Venusque nocent, etc.

See *Anthol. Lat.*, ed. Riese, 633, or Scaliger's *Catalecta Virgilii*, p. 174.

This might have been added to my notes on Lyly's plays recently published in *Studies in Philology*, xxii, 267-71.

W. P. MUSTARD.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

## REVIEWS.

---

EZIO LEVI, *Il Principe Don Carlos nella Leggenda e nella Poesia*.  
Seconda, Edizione con 7 Tavole. Fratelli Treves di Roma.  
[1924.]

Dr. Levi's study of the Don Carlos theme is one of the "Pubblicazioni Dell' Istituto Cristoforo Colombo," and appears just ten years after his *Storia Poetica di Don Carlos* (Pavia, 1914). Since the earlier volume is now difficult to obtain, we must be grateful for the new publication.

Dr. Levi's new volume, with its new title, is hardly more than a reprint of the earlier work. About seven pages of the 1914 edition (chiefly direct quotations from Schiller's drama) are omitted in 1924; about a dozen pages (mainly footnotes) of the 1924 edition are not to be found in the edition of 1914. The material of 1914 is divided into twelve chapters, that of 1924 into ten. The headings of the first nine chapters in each edition differ slightly; the last three chapters of 1914 make one chapter in 1924. Other changes are of minor significance—a word or phrase changed here and there, two sentences (more frequently two paragraphs) combined into one. The 1914 version has 435 pages, the 1924 version 427.

One gets the impression that the 1924 version was prepared in great haste. Although "errata" of 1914 have been corrected, new mistakes have crept in; the preface and the index of illustrations of the 1914 edition have been omitted in 1924; and in ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~new~~ <sup>new</sup> ~~edition~~ <sup>edition</sup> probably due to haste in binding the book—one whole ~~section~~ <sup>section</sup> (pages 305-320) has dropped out entirely. Neither edition contains what would greatly have enhanced the value of the work—a general index of authors and subjects.

In his first chapter—"Il Principe Don Carlos"—Levi marshals the well-known facts presented by Cabrera, Gachard, Maurenbrecher, Prescott, Buedinger, Rachfahl, and others to show that the prince was a sickly, deformed, and dissipated youth rather than the handsome, idealistic, cosmopolitan dreamer of the later dramas. In the second chapter—"La Regina Elisabetta e la Principessa D'Eboli"—Levi gives in detail the historically accurate facts concerning the two most important feminine characters in the treatments of the Don Carlos theme.

Having thus given the historical background, Levi proceeds to outline the development of the Don Carlos legend. He shows how the French poem *Diogenes* (written in Flanders in 1581) and the more or less historical accounts by Brantôme, Matthieu,

Méseray, and Mayerne-Turquet laid the basis for future treatments of the theme. He might have emphasized the fact that all these authors are mentioned by St. Réal in footnotes of his *Don Carlos: Nouvelle Historique* (1672), the dominating source for later literary treatments and the source which emphasizes one all-important element—the love of Carlos for his stepmother and former fiancée.

In the fourth chapter, "La Leggenda di Don Carlos nel Teatro Spagnuolo," Levi devotes almost a hundred pages to a thorough outline, analysis, and discussion of Enciso's *El Principe Don Carlos* (written between 1620 and 1628, first published in 1634)—one of the most important treatments of the theme, and especially interesting because it makes no mention of any love on Carlos's part for the wife of his father.

Levi discusses the two versions of Enciso's drama—that of 1634, in which Carlos is miraculously cured of his illness, and that of 1773, in which he dies as a result of his own wild excesses. Levi rightly gives credit to J. P. W. Crawford for pointing out in 1907 that the conclusion of the 1773 version was the work of Cañizares. He might have mentioned, however, that Adolf Schaeffer, when publishing in 1887 his German translation of the drama, shrewdly surmised that the tragic end of the 1773 version had been inserted by Cañizares. This later version, it should be noted, more than any other later treatment of the theme, agrees closely with accepted historical facts. Levi concludes the chapter with a discussion of Montalban's *El Segundo Séneca de España* and with an interesting but not definitely proven assertion that Enciso's drama exerted an influence on Calderon's *La Vida é un Sogno*.

The fifth chapter deals with French treatments of the theme in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—Brantôme, St. Réal, Racine, and Voltaire (supposed to have been influenced by St. Réal), and Campistron's *Andronic* (in which the scene is set in Constantinople and the characters assume Eastern names). It is to be regretted that Levi was unable to refer, except in footnotes, to the scholarly work on St. Réal by Gustave Duval (1921).

The sixth chapter is devoted entirely to Otway's drama, the seventh to the Italian dramas of the seventeenth century (mainly, of course, to Alfieri, although some pages are devoted to Pepoli, Polidori, and the Italian adaptations of Campistron), and the eighth to Schiller's *Don Carlos*. In discussing these important dramas, Levi is at his best. Though at times diffuse, he sums up skillfully the facts that he regards as indispensable for a correct understanding of the works.

The last two chapters comprise only one-tenth of the whole book.

The ninth chapter, with the curiously ambitious title "La Leggenda di Don Carlos nel Romanticismo Tedesco," deals with only two German dramas—the comparatively unknown *Carlos und Elizabeth* by Johann Wilhelm Rose (Leipzig, 1802) and the long but highly interesting *Don Carlos, Infant von Spanien* by Fouqué (Danzig, 1823). Though Fouqué's play has the same title as Schiller's and though it begins with a "Zueignung an Friedrich Schiller" (six stanzas in ottava rima), Levi maintains that Fouqué was influenced mainly by Enciso. The tenth and last chapter devotes twenty pages to what Levi chooses to call French, Italian, and Spanish romanticists—Chénier, Soumet, Cormon, Nuñez de Arce, and Verhaeren. Here again one is disappointed to find only one page for a discussion of Nuñez de Arce's deservedly famous *El Haz de Leña*.

One's final judgment of Levi's work depends largely on the purpose he had in mind when he started his investigations. If he intended to discuss thoroughly the most important authors (more than half of the book is concerned with Enciso, St. Réal, Campistrón, Otway, Alfieri, and Schiller) and to mention others only in passing, he has performed his task well. If, on the other hand, he intended to cite, even though casually, as many treatments as possible, he has not been successful.

Levi is most thorough in his discussion of Italian and Spanish treatments; additional titles that might be suggested are of little importance. In the English, French, and German fields, however, he has merely skimmed the surface. He has not used material which he might easily have had access. One is chagrined, more-  
 over, that in the ten years intervening between the publication of his first book and his second he has added practically nothing. (page Levi cites altogether about thirty treatments of the edition contain matter of fact, the number is nearer one hundred. the work—a good criticism might also be offered because Levi has

In his first book the excellent list (contained in the 1914 edition) lacks the welch treatments of the theme; because he does not take into account the French translations of St. Réal, which, in fact, are really a prince's, and chiefly because he has not attempted to deal with translations of important treatments into foreign languages. Though Schiller's drama, for example, has been translated into English more often than any other of Schiller's plays except *Wilhelm Tell*, Levi does not mention one of these translations.

The criticisms given above should not detract from the value of the book, which shows conclusively the desirability of examining literary treatments of such a historical character as Don Carlos. Toward the end of his last chapter Levi states that "la leggenda di Don Carlos é una della più ricche e della più suggestive della letteratura moderna." This statement bears out Madame de Staël's

(in *De l'Allemagne*, Chapter XV) "le sujet de Don Carlos est un de plus dramatiques que l'histoire puisse offrir" and Campistron's (in the introduction to his *Andronic*) that Don Carlos "est le sujet le plus touchant et le plus singulier qui ait jamais été traité."

FREDERICK W. C. LIEDER.

Harvard University.

*Les Poésies de Jausbert de Puycibot.* Editées par WILLIAM P. SHEPARD. Paris, 1924.

A welcome addition to the fast-growing collection of the *Classiques Français du Moyen Age* is the excellent edition of the poetry of Jausbert de Puycibot by Professor William P. Shepard, the first American to edit a Provençal text for the series. American scholars, to be sure, have studied Provençal grammar and literature to some extent: but the texts published by them have been written in the language of the North rather than in that of the South.

Professor Shepard has broken new ground in selecting for his labors one of the few previously unedited troubadours, ignored in the Chrestomathies and literary histories and known only through his romantic biography. Yet Jausbert de Puycibot, if not a true poet like Bernart de Ventadorn, is well worth editing. In his fifteen authentic pieces, amid much that is conventional, or, and insipid, there is some originality and an occasional true feeling.

Like the other texts in the series, the edition of Jausbert consists of an introduction on the life and work of the poet; accompanied by a French translation; and appendices, variant readings and indices. The whole work is carefully and capably done.

The *Introduction* adds to our knowledge of the life of the poet by identifying the monastery which he entered in his youth, and by dating his poetic activity through a careful study of the poems named in his poems. Interesting passages in which he makes sense by his contemporaries are supplied later on by

An interesting problem treated in the introduction is in determining Jausbert's authentic works. Professor Shepard accepts the attribution of the *Grundriss*, and, in addition, prints separately the poems, Jausbert's authorship of which is uncertain. It is as a *tenso*, set poems, however, but another (37, 1 of the *Grundriss*) is supplied by Shepard, that supplies the problem. This poem, with no title (Bartsch, 174, 2), form a *tenso* on the subject of one of Jausbert's authentic poems (no. V), namely whether preference should be given to young or to older women. In 174, 2, the names "En Jausbert" and "Mos Audibertz" are found: and the other poem, 37, 1, found in three

manuscripts, is attributed by one of them, D, to a "Gausbertz en Bernart de Durfort." Though the other two attribute it to a certain "Ogier," Schultz [-Gora],<sup>1</sup> relying on D, ascribes it to Bernart de Durfort. Now we know from a document cited by Paul Meyer in the *Histoire Générale de Languedoc*,<sup>2</sup> that this Bernart was called "Albert" by Raymond V of Toulouse, who had given him his castle: and the name "Albert" resembles somewhat the "Gausbert" of the "Gausbertz en Bernart de Durfort" of D, also the "Jausbert" of 174, 2. This latter poem, ascribed by D to Bertran de Preissac, is generally attributed to him now. A Bertran is, indeed, one of the interlocutors in both 37, 1 and 174, 2, as well as in Jausbert de Puycibot's poem. The last is the work that causes the difficulty. It is a *tenson* between the author himself and Bertran, not only on the same subject as the other two poems, but it expresses the same ideas, even using the same words. Yet if Jausbert de Puycibot is really the author of No. V of Shepard's edition, who is the author of 37, 1? Did Bernart de Durfort write a *sirventes* supporting Jausbert's side of the argument, and Bertran de Preissac reply to him, maintaining the side he had already taken against Jausbert? Possibly the memory of Jausbert's part in the dispute might have tended to corrupt Bernart's nickname "Albert" into "Gaubert." I think Professor Shepard right in not publishing 37, 1 with Jausbert's work: but it is to be hoped that he will soon publish both this poem and 174, in<sup>2</sup>, as he promises, with a complete discussion of their literary relationship.

As to the two *indices*, the one containing the proper names is excellent. The word-index, on the other hand, seems somewhat faulty, though no more so than those in other volumes of the series. *Some* difficulties in making a small list containing all words with editorial meanings and no others are insuperable. The value of glosses of this type, therefore, seems to me doubtful. A set of notes

In his *ing* unusual constructions as well as meanings, such as *apals* the well-known Salverda de Grave's edition of Ue de St. Circ, *inbrecher*, *Paged* *trianthothèque méridionale*, would seem more useful. *a prince v*, and *chant* thing, however, is the text with its translations of it itself, I have only one slight suggestion. II, *though* Schiller's *dram*

*dis* often that *n ai negun desmentir*

not *car cujava ver dir*

*n a*

This reading does not agree very well with what precedes. The poet has just told us on having formerly praised the good qualities his lady did not possess. I should prefer the variant reading:

<sup>1</sup> *ZrPh.* VII (1883); 181.

<sup>2</sup> VII, 445.

*Non ai peccat del mentir  
Car eu cujava ver dir*

There remains the translation. This, in general is excellent, accurate and clear, fairly literal without being word-for-word. I have a few suggestions to make, however.

V, 58. The phrase *tira jornau* is translated "*fait une journée de travail*." *Jornal* or *jornau* means "a day's pay," as well as a "day's work," and that seems to me the meaning here, as it corresponds better with the rest of the piece. Jausbert has previously used the expression *se (vol) en velha logar*, translated "*se louer à une vieille*" and the *reward* to be gained from an old woman has been stressed by his opponent throughout the piece. That *tirar* may be used in the sense of drawing pay may be seen from the following passage from the *Breviari d'Amor*, lines 17803-5:

*Per so que ls pague largamen  
E quant ilh an tirat l'argen,  
Fan lur comte.*

VIII, 31. *Eras penet ma follor* is translated as "Maintenant je me repens de ma folie." The translation is in harmony with the rest of the piece, but can *penet* mean "je me repens"? If it is from *penedir*, and used as it is here, it means "to expiate."

VIII, 48-50.

*Per que totz clamanz  
Volgra termenes, seignor  
Del greu mal de sa calor*

is translated "voilà pourquoi, messeigneurs, je voudrais qu'elle tuât tous ses soupirants par le grand feu de sa chaleur." This seems to me rather far-fetched. I should prefer to take *termenes* as a plural noun rather than a verb, and translate: "Voilà pourquoi, tout en me plaignant, je chercherais la fin du grand mal de sa chaleur."

IX, 9. *De gaug camjera·l marit brau* is translated "avec joie elle changerait ce mari farouche." It seems probable to me that the subject is first person here, though either one makes sense.

X, 43.

*Si amars es bos mestiers  
Don sol venir pretz entiers  
Quar leialtatz per trair  
Se pert e vers per mentir*

"Mais la loyauté a fait place à la trahison, et la vérité au mensonge" is the translation for the last two lines. I cannot understand why this passage is put in the past. It seems to me a general statement and should be translated "la loyauté fait place" etc.

Professor Shepard's accuracy extends to his typography, errors in which are remarkably few. I have found only three in the whole work. In the bibliography, *Roman. Studien* should read

*Roman. Arbeiten*, a rather unfortunate mistake. In the text, IX, 24 has *deziram* for *deziran*, and in the table of contents *belh* of IX appears as *belk*. The reference to Schultz's work in the bibliography is not quite correct as to page. Furthermore, the alphabetical order in which Bartsch listed the poems, and which Professor Shepard apparently intended to keep, is altered by this change of the spelling of "*Oimais*," the first word of VII, to "*Huemais*."

EDWARD L. ADAMS.

*University of Michigan.*

---

*Das Zentrale Problem in der Tragödie Friedrich Hebbels.* By ELISE DOSENHEIMER. Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1925. Pp. vii, 114.

The author's name is held in pleasant remembrance for her instructive essay, *Friedrich Hebbels Auffassung vom Staat und sein Trauerspiel Agnes Bernauer* (1912). In the present study her main proposition is that the well-recognized issues between man and woman in Hebbel's dramas, except *Agnes Bernauer*, are reducible to a metaphysical sex dualism. Considerable stress is laid on a diary entry (T. III, 4189) in which Hebbel criticizes Laube's *Monaldeschi* and points out how it might have been based on sex dualism as a part of the fundamental dualism of the world. The passage does indeed show that Hebbel recognized a possible tragedy in such a theme, but no inference is permissible from this as to his own dramas. In outlining the hypothetical course of Laube's play he is careful to say that the special conflict should arise between man as man and woman as woman. In considering Dosenheimer's proposition we must apply the same test to each of his own plays. Does Hebbel conceive of the special issue between the man and the woman in a given drama as conditioned by their sex, and hence as inevitable apart from their human individuality?

The question thus put is, as far as I know, new and interesting. Dosenheimer answers it unhesitatingly in the affirmative. In my opinion not correctly so. The reasons, as far as I can give them here, are the following. If Hebbel had intended to portray his men and women as separated through sex by *eine metaphysisch unheilbare Dissonanz* (p. 118), then the specific conflict in each case would have to be expressed in acts and conceptions characteristic of each sex respectively and incomprehensible to the opposite sex, and this in their highest representatives, not in partial representatives. Hebbel generally shows us women tragically misunderstood by men, but he pictures other men who would not have erred in the same way. Holofernes' brutality is not a "meta-



physical" masculine trait. Other heroic figures of the poet, a Gyges, a Demetrius, would not be guilty of that. In *Genoveva* it is true the blindness of Siegfried seems to rest on such a fundamental masculinity when he believes his friend (as a man) rather than his wife (the woman). This situation is perhaps the strongest support of the author's proposition to be found in Hebbel, and she makes good use of it. Yet the separation between Siegfried and Genoveva is no greater in the end than that between Siegfried and Golo. In Golo too we have a man who would not have sinned in Siegfried's way against Genoveva.

This alignment is even more apparent in *Herodes und Mariamne* and *Gyges*. In each of these dramas the poet has created a man who in the specific conflict clearly recognizes the blindness of the tragic hero: Soemus and Gyges. Mariamne says to Soemus:

Ich bitt' Dir ab, Du stehst zu ihm wie ich,  
Du bist, wie ich, in Deinem Heiligsten  
Gekränkt, wie ich, zum Ding herabgesetzt!  
Er ist ein Freund, wie er ein Gatte ist.

It is the *Mensch* not the woman who speaks here. And Rhodope says to Gyges:

Du hättest mich der Heimat nicht entführt  
Um so an mir zu tun!

A "metaphysical" blindness would necessarily be shared by all men alike. And Kandaules himself recognizes his error in the end.

The same thing is true of *Maria Magdalena*. The masculine prejudices that drive the girl, the tragic victim, out of the world are already surmounted by a man, a member of that same social order, the Secretary. They are in no sense *unheilbar*.

This does not detract from Hebbel's originality as the first great dramatist to show the sexes in a problematic relation. Society first brought them into such a relation and Hebbel's tragedies reflect the social problem. In this sense he characterized them as *künstlerische Opfer der Zeit*. The meaning of his statement that man and not society should liberate woman is that man should learn to treat her as an individual in her given sphere. He could not urge men to do that in the face of *eine metaphysisch unheilbare Dissonanz*, nor would that allow him to show us such men as Soemus and Gyges.

The author's preoccupation with her thesis occasionally leads her to interpret the tragedies dogmatically. A striking illustration is her identification in *Judith* of the Jewish-Heathen conflict with the man-woman conflict. The contradiction between the two factors has been pointed out convincingly, among others by Meyer-Benfey. Dosenheimer apparently sees the Jewish-Heathen con-

flict merge into the man-woman dualism: "Der welthistorisch-geistige Prozess zwischen zwei ethisch-religiösen Bewusstseinswelten wird als der zwischen den Geschlechtern anhängige Prozess ausgefochten" (p. 37). The logical hiatus here is enormous. What has the Jewish-Heathen conflict to do with the sexes? It would take more than Hebbel's eloquence to answer this question.

Finally, if Hebbel had based his tragedies on a *metaphysisch unheilbare Dissonanz* between the sexes, he would be worse off with his metaphysics than he is anyway. For we no longer believe in an absolute physical difference between the sexes, much less a *metaphysisch unheilbare Dissonanz*. A good many of the author's sentences read as if written in a time of greater confidence in metaphysical phrases than the present.

On the other hand the monograph in question has many things to commend it, among them the three following: Frequent stimulating points of view, a sound analysis of the dramas by a person thoroughly familiar with Hebbel, an analysis that gains by not being rigidly subordinated to the main thesis, and finally a very suggestive and interesting comparison of Hebbel, Ibsen, Strindberg, and Wedekind in their treatment of woman.

Wesleyan University.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

*The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald.* By L. R. MERRILL.  
Yale Studies in English, LXIX. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925. 460 pp. \$4.50.

The main object of this dissertation has been "to present a life of Grimald, the facts of which have not been known; to reproduce the text of his two Latin dramas, *Christus Redivivus* and *Archipropheta*, the latter of which has been inaccessible to students of early sixteenth-century drama; and to present both of these plays in translation." It contains a good chapter on the life of Grimald, it provides two interesting prefaces to his Latin plays, and it reprints the shorter poems which were included in *Tottel's Miscellany*, as well as six others which have been preserved elsewhere.

Perhaps the most useful comment on it would be to add a few suggestions to the notes. And first a few guesses at Grimald's sources, which may serve to supplement Mr. H. H. Hudson's illuminating article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 388-394.

P. 375. The poem *A True Love* contains various fancies which may be traced to Virgil, or ultimately to Theocritus (*Id.* ix, 34-35; xii, 3-9; i, 132-35). But perhaps they came to Grimald through some such neo-Latin poem as Andrea Navagero's *Iolas*. Compare the opening lines,

What sweet relief the showers to thirstie plants we see:  
What dere delite, the blooms to bees: my true love is to mee,

with *Iolas*, 22-23,

Dulce apibus flores, rivi sitientibus herbis,  
Gramen ovi, caprae cytusus, Amaryllis Iolae;

and the lines,

As fresh and lusty vere foule winter doth exceed,  
As morning bright with scarlet sky doth passe the evenings weed,  
As melow peares above the crabs esteemed be,  
So doth my love surmount them all, whom yet I hap to see,

with *Iolas*, 68-73,

Quantum ver formosum hieme est iucundius atra,  
Quantum mite pirum sorbis est dulcius ipsis,  
Quantum hirsuta capella suo saetosior haedo,  
Quantum nocturnis obscuri Vesperis umbris  
Puniceo exsurgens Aurora nitentior ortu est,  
Tantum, Amarylli, aliis mihi carior ipsa puellis.

P. 379. The poem *The Muses* was probably suggested by some such poem as the *Nomina Musarum* or *De Musarum Inventis* (variously ascribed to Virgil, to Cato, to Ausonius). E. K. ascribed it to Virgil, on *S. C.* iv, 100 and xi, 53. See *Anthol. Lat.*, ed. Riese, no. 664; Ausonius, ed. Peiper, p. 412. Compare Grimald's line, "Delitefull talk loves Comical Thaley," with the Latin line, "Comica lascivo gaudet sermone Thalia"; "Lord Phoebus in the mids . . . embraceth all," with "In medio residens complectitur omnia Phoebus."

P. 393. The beginning of the poem *To L. J. S.*,

Charis the fourth, Pieris the tenth, the second Cypris, Jane,  
One to assemblies three adjoyned,

is very like one of Sannazaro's *Epigrams*, III, 2,

Quarta Charis, decima es mihi Pieris, altera Cypris,  
Cassandra, una choris addita diva tribus.

P. 389. The lines *To his familiar Friend* are based on an epigram of Muretus. See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 393.

P. 393. *The Garden* is a paraphrase of a Latin poem *De laude Horti*, or *De Laudibus Hortuli*,

Adeste, Musae, maximi proles Iovis,  
Laudes feracis praedicemus hortuli, etc.

See *Anthol. Lat.*, ed. Riese, 635, or Scaliger's *Catalecta Virgilii*, Leyden ed. 1617, p. 176.

A few of the notes on the shorter poems need revision:

P. 376, l. 4. "Ayelife left" represents Beza's "posito . . . numine" (quoted on p. 417). "Ayelife" is apparently a sub-

stantive, meaning "life for ever." It is not recorded in the *N.E.D.*

P. 376, l. 6. A "gripe" is a vulture. "Gripes name" is a translation of Beza's "vulturis . . . nomine."

P. 377, l. 20. "Ceres imp": Proserpina. See Ovid, *Met.* v, 391 ff.

P. 398, l. 13. "Sicil brethren": two famous brothers of Catania (mentioned, e. g., by Seneca, *De Benef.* III, 37, 2). Their names are variously given: Amphinomus and Anapius, or Anapis, Damon and Phintias, Philonomus and Callias. See Robinson Ellis's note on the Latin poem *Aetna*, 624 ff., or J. Vessereau's note on the same passage.

P. 408, l. 25. "The latine Muses and the Grayes": a translation of Beza's "Latinae Graiaequ Camoenae."

P. 408, l. 27. "Hertpersyng Pitho": a translation of Beza's "flexanimis Pitho." *Peitho* was the Greek goddess of persuasion, or winning eloquence.

On p. 59 the editor comments on the number of Virgilian phrases which occur in Grimald's Latin poems, and he quotes some of them in footnotes to his text. A few others might have been cited. Cp. p. 194, l. 6, with *Aen.* I, 94; p. 204, l. 15, with *Aen.* I, 153; p. 206, ll. 1-4, with *Ecl.* VI, 82-86; p. 272, l. 26, with *Geor.* I, 330; p. 306, l. 28, with *Aen.* V, 720; p. 352, l. 14, with *Aen.* IX, 441; p. 356, l. 4, with *Aen.* II, 6; p. 410, l. 15, with *Geor.* IV, 168. It would be an interesting task for some young scholar to study Grimald's use of Plautus and Terence.

W. P. MUSTARD.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum Heliand und zur altsächsischen Genesis*, von EDWARD H. SEHRT. [*Hesperia*, Nr. 14.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1925.)

The *Hesperia* Series has been characterized by many excellent monographs on various phases of Germanic philology. The latest one to make its appearance as Nr. 14 is no exception to the rule. It is a monumental piece of work, a real labor of love. Moreover, it fills a real need and puts scholars in the possession of an unsurpassed critical apparatus in the field of Old Saxon. Schmeller's *Glossarium* made no claim to completeness and, moreover, uses Latin. Heyne's *Glossar*, although it sufficed for the needs of the ordinary student, was likewise not full. Still it did give the forms of the words in the other Germanic dialects. Its chief fault is that it uses the now antiquated method of listing words containing a short root vowel separately from those having a long one. Sievers

never published the second volume of his *Heliant* edition which was to be a *Worterbuch des gesamten as. Wortvorrats*. Otto Basler in his volume of *Altsächsisch* in 1923 announced that he was preparing a complete dictionary of the *Heliant* and *Genesis*. How much of it he completed before the appearance of the present work, we do not know. It is not likely, however, that he will be inclined to finish it now that Sehart has anticipated him. It is one of those unfortunate occurrences which are bound to happen from time to time.

Sehart's work is not only exhaustive, giving every occurrence of every word, but also the latest etymology by references to the third volume of Fick's *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, revised by Falk and Torp. It is to be regretted, I think, that Sehart does not give the etymology himself. This would, of course, have increased the size and expense of the work considerably, but would have relieved the student of the necessity of having a copy of Fick and of continually referring to it. A valuable feature of Sehart's work, however, is that the syntax of each word receives full treatment and frequent references are made to Behagel's *Syntax des Heliant*. An idea of the completeness and thoroughness of the treatment may be obtained from the fact that 36 columns or 18 pages are devoted to the consideration of *an*, as an independent word and as an element in verbal compounds. In it every possible shade of meaning is methodically set forth and properly classified. A list of proper names is added to the dictionary and is similarly complete and exhaustive. Where, as in the case of Herod, more than one person is meant, these are carefully distinguished and listed separately. In spite of the painstaking care that has been expended on the work, a few typographical errors have crept in and some omissions have occurred. These are given at the end under the heading *Nachträge und Berichtigungen*. The reviewer has not had the time to examine all of the 741 pages in detail, but has been impressed by the excellence of the printing and by the scholarly and methodical character of the work.

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

*Jefferson et les Idéologues*, by GILBERT CHINARD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, and Paris: Les Presses Universitaires, 1925.

The key to the significance of Ideology in the history of French thought is to be found in the political situation at the time of the Revolution. Ideology was a science of ideas. It had three tenets,

(1) that the proper method for studying anything was analytical, (2) that an analysis of all ideas would reduce them without exception to sensation, (3) that such things as "ultimate causes" and "first principles," even if existent, were not open to human investigation. These three tenets were the exact antithesis to the Catholic philosophy of the time, which was the philosophy of the *ancien régime*. Catholic philosophy held that some ideas were above analysis, that some were innate and some supernaturally acquired, and that the first and ultimate cause of the world and everything in it was God, whose being and attributes could all be found in the tradition of the Synagogue and Church.

Ideology was the philosophy of the Revolution. It elaborated the most articulate of its apologies, founded its school system, educated its professors, was responsible for everything but its excesses. Its purpose was to disintegrate all authority both philosophic and political and to make the individual completely autonomous. Whereas the Church said that the individual was incapable either of truth or of political sovereignty, Ideology said that only the individual was capable of either of them.

That this philosophy, which Victor Cousin righteously called "the root of the country's misery," was the philosophy of Jefferson had been suspected before M. Chinard's book appeared but had not, I believe, been proved. Jefferson of course had no patience with metaphysics. He refused to bother with it; it was a study which seemed useless to him. He wrote to Clark Sheldon:

"I revolt against all metaphysical readings, in which class your 'New pamphlet' must at least be placed. Some acquaintance with the operations of the mind is worth acquiring. But any *one* of the writers suffices for that: Locke, Kaimes, Hartley, Reid, Stewart, Brown, Tracy, etc. These dreams of the day, like those of the night, vanish in vapour, leaving not a wreck behind. The business of life is with matter. That gives us tangible results. Handling that, we arrive at the Knowledge of the axe, the plough, the steam-boat and everything useful in life; but from metaphysical speculations I have never seen one useful result."<sup>1</sup>

What Jefferson appreciated in Tracy and his Ideology was the political theory which he found there. It was a duplicate of his own. He was so appreciative of it that he supervised the publication both of Tracy's commentary of Montesquieu and of his treatise on political economy. It is in fact largely the story of these two publications that the volume which we are reviewing narrates. It is noticeable that Tracy's chapter's on love, which had been practically omitted from the French edition and sent to Monticello for translation and publication never saw the light in this country. Aside from the question of the kind of reception they would have received at the hands of Jefferson's unsophisticated contemporaries, they were foreign to the main lesson which the

<sup>1</sup> *Jefferson et les Idéologues*, p. 282.

President wished the book to teach, namely the Jeffersonian principle that paper money was an invention of the Devil.

When one penetrates beyond the screen of politeness which conceals the true thought at times of the correspondence of Jefferson and Destutt de Tracy, one perceives that the former saw in these publications a chance of fortifying his own position and the latter a chance of spreading the truth in the one society still capable of profiting by it. Jefferson was above all a practical man: he wished to provide a Jeffersonian text-book for legislators. Having written nothing himself which would do, he published the next best thing, a French parallel of his own theories.

M. Chinard's documents concern primarily students of political science and history, but they are not without interest also for the student of literature. For to study it is to study the curriculum of Stendhal, who was educated in the ideological school at Grenoble. His youthful heroes were Tracy, Cabanis, and Say. Their analytical method and nominalism found an echo in his novels and essays. He hated the *phrases louches* of "Plato, Kant and their school" (*sic*). The Stendhalian tradition must be traced back to them if it is to be thoroughly understood. Moreover, when the *Physiologies* come to be studied, it will be found that they too take their rise in Ideology, not now in Tracy but in the famous *Rapports* of Cabanis. Ideology, throughout the first part of the Nineteenth Century was the philosophy of liberalism just as it had been during the Revolution. In the second half its place was taken by Positivism. Its methods and its presuppositions do not die out in French cultural history but pass from academic thought into literature. The whole philosophy of naturalism, the notion that literature studies man as if he were an animal, is quite in keeping with the theory of Tracy, that "Ideology is a part of zoology." It is more than likely that it is an outgrowth of it.

M. Chinard's book clarifies another question, that of Jefferson's opinion of France. In America he was considered a gallomaniac, whereas in this volume he is shown to have been both restrained and independent in his French relationships. He admired the liberal philosophers of France but differed even with them on the question of centralization. He had nothing but condemnation for the excesses of Napoleon and the stupidity of the Restoration. In fact the French were more enthusiastic about him than he was about them. The liberals saw in him and, alas, in the United States, the one hope of freedom. They recognised that their cause had been defeated at home and throughout Europe; they believed that America was to be the seat of its final triumph. Could Destutt de Tracy have read his friend's letters to John Adams and Adams's replies, even that faith would have been shaken. One could read scarcely anything more pathetic than the avowals of disappoint-

ment made by these two ex-presidents, each of whom had hoped that they would achieve an improvement in the lot of mankind.

GEORGE BOAS.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Origins of Poe's Critical Theory*, by MARGARET ALTERTON (University of Iowa Studies, Iowa City, 1925).

The most important contribution that Miss Alterton makes to her subject appears in her initial chapter, in which she demonstrates quite conclusively that Poe not only owed to *Blackwood's Magazine* materials that he employed in several of his stories, but that he also found in *Blackwood's* and other British magazines hints and suggestions for certain general situations and methods that he adopted in his tales (in particular, the analysis of sensation and emphasis upon the horrible), and, further, that he derived from the British periodicals the suggestion of some of his critical hobbies. In subsequent chapters she endeavors to show that Poe was largely influenced in his critical theorizing by his reading in the fields of law, the fine arts and the drama, philosophy, and the natural sciences. And incidentally she calls attention to a number of items not hitherto associated with Poe which she believes to be the work of his hand.

In her endeavor to prove that Poe was under obligations for his critical dicta and methods to the law and to the advice of lawyers Miss Alterton is not entirely convincing. Is it necessary to look beyond Poe's own natural gifts and tendencies to account for his insistence upon terseness, lucidity, and orderly arrangement? In her efforts to establish an indebtedness to the fine arts and to the natural sciences, moreover, Miss Alterton leans too heavily on the new items that she attributes to Poe, some of which, to be sure, are almost certainly Poe's, while others—as the essay in *Burton's* on "The Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia"—are assuredly not in Poe's manner, and still others—as the four essays in the *Messenger* on "New Views of the Solar System," etc.—labor under a heavy burden of external evidence against their authenticity. On the other hand, she brings out several very interesting cases of verbal borrowing on the part of Poe,—notably, in his paraphrasing from Dick's *Christian Philosopher* in "Eiros and Charmion" and from the *Christian Philosopher* and Bethune's *Life of Kepler* in *Eureka*.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

*University of Texas.*

---



*Shakspeare's Debt to Montaigne*, by GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1925.

Ever since Capell one hundred and forty years ago discovered the borrowing from Montaigne of the famous passage about the ideal commonwealth in *The Tempest*, critics have wrangled over the indebtedness of Shakspeare to the Florio translation of the French essayist. The majority of critics have contended that except certain obvious borrowings such as that mentioned the parallels are merely fortuitous; others have, however, maintained that Shakspeare made frequent use of Montaigne. Taylor's monograph attempts to settle the dispute by showing that the resemblances are too numerous to be the result of chance and that their cumulative effect betrays the strong influence of the translation on the English playwright.

The evidence falls into three divisions: (1) the phrasal similarity of passages in Shakspeare after 1603, the date of the publication of the Florio translation, and Montaigne so close as to preclude all doubt of borrowing; (2) passages so similar and numerous as to suggest borrowing; (3) a list of some 750 words from the Florio Montaigne which Shakspeare used only during or after 1603. It is the cumulative character of this evidence that makes it tantamount to proof. Almost any two parallel passages might when taken by themselves be regarded as independent of each other. When Gloucester says in *King Lear* (IV, vi, 63)

When misery could beguile the tyrant's rage  
And frustrate his proud will,

it does not seem necessary to go to Montaigne's "Frustrate the Tyrants cruelty" as its source, or when Kent says "Approve the common saw," to produce Montaigne's "Approve the common saying" as a deadly parallel. But when these parallels extend over eighteen pages, one is forced to abandon the theory of chance for that of design. We know that Shakspeare had read Montaigne, that he had a very retentive memory, and that he had a feeling for words and a marvellous faculty for appropriating them whenever he found them. It is hardly chance that there should be over 750 words in the plays of 1603 and later but not in the earlier plays, and that these words should all be found in Florio. If it were a crime to steal words surely Shakspeare would be convicted.

One does not need to assume that the dramatist deliberately transferred these words and phrases from Florio's page to his own. Shakspeare was struck by their vital character, he kept them in solution in his marvellous memory, and when occasion served, he precipitated them upon his own pages. A good illustration of the way his mind worked is shown in the parallel between Hamlet's

the thousand natural shocks  
That flesh is heir to

and Montaigne's

And question might be made, whether according to her [the mind's] *natural* condition she [the mind] might at any time be so [settled]: But to joyne constancie unto it in her last perfection: I meane if nothing should *shock* her: which a *thousand* accidents may doe.

Shakspere's faculty for creating the effective phrase might easily have been furnished with its materials by the words hidden in this passage, and it is Hamlet's when he needed it for his soliloquy.

Taylor notes that the parallels are more numerous in the plays about 1603, with two or three exceptions, than in those removed from that date. Which means that Shakspere read the book when it came out and made most use of it at that time. The two striking exceptions are *The Tempest*, which is, of course, late and yet has as many as eight parallel passages, and *Othello*, which is dated about 1604 and has only four. The fact that the former play has the famous passage about the ideal commonwealth may indicate that Shakspere went back to Montaigne for the specific details and at the same time freshened his memory by running through certain parts of the book. *Othello*, on the other hand, was not a play to lend itself to the philosophizings of Montaigne. Its action is too rapid and concentrated.

Taylor hazards with considerable hesitation the guess that the change in the nature of Shakspere's thought in the plays of 1603 and after was in part due to the contents of Montaigne's essays. It probably was—in part. Whatever entered into the dramatist's mind and life, his personal experience, his constantly developing philosophy of life, his realization of tragedy as the supreme artistic expression of literary genius, must have directed him toward the tragic drama. We cannot be as certain of the influence of Montaigne in the sphere of thought as of Florio's translation in the field of words and phrases. And not only does Taylor make this evidence convincing but he also shows how Shakspere transformed into his own likeness whatever came to his hand. He is not the less Shakspere because he captured words from Florio.

JAMES W. TUPPER.

Lafayette College.

---

*Aesthetics and Art in the Astrée of Honoré d'Urfé.* Diss. Catholic University. By Sister MARY CATHERINE McMAHON. Washington, 1925. 144 pp.

Prejudice concerning the value of printed Doctor's dissertations is strong—and often well deserved. There are exceptions, however; and this one, which makes excellent and interesting reading,—and moreover is very timely, since France just celebrated the three hundredth anniversary of d'Urfé's death,—may well be considered as such. It reveals an unusually broad acquaintance with historical background, not only the field of history proper, but of Renaissance culture in general—art, architecture, literature, religion, philosophy, social customs, etc. The author tells us that many erudite friends offered valuable contributions; and indeed we readily believe it, for it would be very unusual that one person, at the age of the studies for the Ph. D., should have such wide and varied information. Moreover the whole subject is very neatly and systematically presented. The erudition never degenerates into pedantry,—a quality by no means too common in our American dissertations; everywhere one feels the direction of a master hand.

For the introductory part and whatever concerns the *Astrée* in general, the author does not add very much to Reure's volume (history of the d'Urfé family, of the Bastie château, of the relations of d'Urfé with Diane de Chateaumorand) except a remarkable—and in this case very important,—familiarity with the countryside and the interior of the château. But, when it comes to the special study of art in the *Astrée*, she certainly does. The dissertation is an elaborate development of Reure's remark about the descriptions in the great novel, which are "si abondantes, si amples parfois et presque toujours si remarquables qu'on ne peut les passer sous silence" (p. 258). Reure does, however, hardly more than mention them, and the present study leaves far behind in thoroughness, in accuracy, and in interest the short chapter V of Part II of Germa's *L'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé, sa composition, son influence* (1904).

Chapter III begins the subject proper, the notion of Beauty as conceived by d'Urfé, and the following chapters describe the applications of this conception to rational beings, to animals, to vegetation. One would expect all this to be very dull and vague, but it is not. When one reaches the chapters in which are explained the various theories of love, the originality is not so great, for the whole story of *L'Astrée* is based on them and former students could not possibly pass them unnoticed; but one appreciates here the clear, concrete way in which all this is stated—in strong contrast with the elaborate philosophical vocabulary of professional stamp. And quite original is the way in which Platonic and Christian

morals and aesthetics are blended. Let us add in this connection that the Catholic sympathies of the author are clearly indicated at times e. g., pp. 41-43), but in no way do they narrow the viewpoint. Mythological scenes and descriptions of the feminine charms of *Astrée* or other women are given without undue puritanic reserve. The author is right in recalling Vianey's words that without this romance the great literature of the French Seventeenth century would not be what it became. Judging from the recent interest shown in *L'Astrée*, the experience of La Fontaine may be still ours:

Etant petit garçon, je lisais son roman,  
Et je le lis encore ayant la barbe grise.<sup>1</sup>

*Smith College.*

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Piozzi Marginalia* comprising some Extracts from the Manuscripts of Hester Lynch Piozzi and Annotations from her Books. Edited by PERCIVAL MERRITT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925, pp. xii + 202 + 7.

This attractively-bound and beautifully-printed book would certainly have pleased Mrs. Piozzi. It contains a pleasant, unpretentious account of her long life (she outlived Keats), a useful description of the literature written by and about her, extracts from one of her unpublished note-books, and from her annotations of her last and least-successful publication, *Retrospection*. Whatever value the new material has lies not in itself but in its revelation of Mrs. Piozzi's vivacious personality and active, alert mind. Ten illustrations add to the interest of the book but do not help much with the question, "What would Dr. Johnson have thought of it?"

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

<sup>1</sup> Are there no shortcomings in the little volume? Certainly; but of no great importance. P. 29, the admiration of Perrault ("There is ten times more originality in d'Urfé's work than in the *Iliad*") cannot have much weight, since we know well that Perrault was a modern and would let no occasion pass to belittle Homer. On p. 33-34, Reure's remark to the effect that "Don Juan of Molière is nothing else than a perverted Hylas" is interesting, but needs not be taken too much "au pied de la lettre." Neither ought one to accept blindly Faguet's statement that d'Urfé is the precursor of Fénelon; or Saintsbury's that "Victor Hugo was apparently influenced by it [the *Astrée*]." There is at times too much faith in the printed statements, because "printed." The author's own claims that Rousseau "is certainly indebted to the *Astrée* for his love of nature" (p. 93), or "that it is incontestable that the work of Watteau, Pater, Lancret, and their disciples consisted in placing before our eyes the men and women who formed French society" (p. 121), need strong qualification.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

April, 1926

Number 4

---

## THE *EPILOGUE* TO *DRAMATIS PERSONAE*

BY WATSON KIRKCONNELL

The *Epilogue* to *Dramatis Personae* is a brief deliverance of Browning's mature beliefs in religion and philosophy. The volume to which it forms a pendant was published in 1864, when the poet was in his fifty-second year and at the height of his powers. He had given the world no poetry for nearly ten years, and this decade of silence had witnessed a growth and conflict of human philosophies that had stirred the spiritual life of England to its depths. Moreover, Mrs. Browning had died in 1861, and a man of Browning's temperament must have been driven by this bereavement to a profound scrutiny of the fundamental facts of life. In every way we are led to expect in *Dramatis Personae* a serious exposition of his ultimate philosophy, and in the *Epilogue* a cogent recapitulation of that faith.

To appreciate fully, however, the point and application of his teaching, we must examine for a moment the chief currents of thought in the years during which this volume was being written. There was first of all the steady advance of scientific thought which culminated in Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859. Four years later, in 1863, *The Geological Evidence of the Antiquity of Man* came from the pen of Sir Charles Lyell, the greatest geologist of the century. These books established, once for all, the continuity of man with the lower animals, and many years passed before scandalized ecclesiastics ceased to fight against facts and proceeded to raise religion to a higher and more inspiring plane by the adoption and sublimation of the principle of evolution. This duty is almost immediately, in *Dramatis Personae*, performed by Browning in no unsuccessful manner.

Another feature of the times was the great Oxford Movement inaugurated by those Anglicans who sought to preserve and intensify aspects of religion most typical of the Church of Rome. These Tractarians held that the Church of England was part of the visible Holy Catholic Church and could, through the uninterrupted personal delegation of sanctified authority from bishop to bishop through eighteen centuries, claim, unbroken and undiminished, the prerogatives of the primitive church, conceived of as sacerdotal authority divinely bestowed. Many of the Tractarians, including John Henry Newman, went over to Rome; but many others remained technically in the Anglican Church. These latter formed in 1860 the "English Church Union" with the avowed purpose of upholding the use of eucharistic vestments, elaborate ritual, incense, and other perquisites of the Roman Church. Public feeling ran high and in 1860 and 1861 violent riots broke out in London against the ritualist party. Some measure of justification for this popular outburst came in 1864, when the Pope issued a Syllabus declaring that no man is free to adopt and profess the religion he considers true according to the light of reason; that the Church has the right to employ force in order to impose its doctrines; that metaphysics cannot and ought not to be pursued without reference to ecclesiastical authority; that Catholic states are wrong to allow foreign immigrants to exercise their own religion in public; and that the Pope expressly refused to make terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.

The extremes of the religious reactionaries strengthened the hands of the Broad Church party (best represented by Dr. Jowett), which was interested in German criticism and the scientific philosophy of the day. The year 1860 had been marked by the death of Baur, the head of the Tübingen school, whose *History of the Church* had been an epoch-making work. In that same year appeared a volume of *Essays and Reviews* by seven English writers, of whom six were clergymen. The views advocated in these essays seem mild enough to-day, and many of them would be accepted by most well-educated clergymen, but at the time they produced a very painful impression. The whole spirit of the volume is perhaps expressed in the observation that

If any one perceives to how great an extent the origin itself of Christianity rests upon probable evidence, his principle will relieve him from

many difficulties which might otherwise be very disturbing. For relations which may repose on doubtful grounds as matters of history, and, as history, be incapable of verification, may yet be equally suggestive of true ideas with facts absolutely certain—that is, they may have a spiritual significance although they are historically false.

In 1863, John Colenso, Bishop of Natal, was deposed and excommunicated by his fellow bishops of the Anglican Church for certain critical studies of the *Pentateuch*. The most notable book of this year was a *Life of Christ* by the profound French scholar, Ernest Renan, which maintained a rigid exclusion of all supernatural factors.

Another disturbing factor of the times, and one which menaced Christianity far more closely, was the growing interest in psychical research and the attempt to prove scientifically that the “spirits” of dead people exist. D. D. Home, an American medium, was one of the leading exponents of spiritism in Browning’s day, and won full credence from Mrs. Browning, to her husband’s unbounded disgust.

As might have been expected, *Dramatis Personæ*, published in 1864, is colored through and through with these contemporary conceptions and speculations, yet the point of view is typically Browning’s own, from which he scans out and considers the thought of the day.

Three short poems, *Prospice*, *May and Death*, and *A Face*, seem to spring directly from the death of his wife, and have no intentional further application.

Six others, which form the body of the volume, set forth his philosophical views at great length. *Gold Hair* is a frank counterblast to *Essays and Reviews*. In it, he tries to support the idea of Original Sin by recounting a story of secret covetousness in a Breton saint. *Mr. Sludge, the Medium*, explains the trickery and warped psychology of professional spiritists, illustrating at once the credulity of the public and the self-deception of the medium. In *Caliban upon Setebos*, Browning, pursuant on the doctrine of evolution, represents an undeveloped savage mind ruminating on the nature of God, and, even in his crude way, reaching out after higher conceptions. In *Abt Vogler* and *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, he places in the mouths of a German composer and of a famous Jewish scholar his favorite conception of man, the finite, developing

steadily towards his full realization in the infinite. *A Death in the Desert* represents the last words of the Apostle John, in which he maintains the essential truth of Christianity underneath the change of superficial aspects which the progressive development of man's spiritual life makes necessary.

A second group of six poems deals with the principle of Love, on which the whole of his moral and religious doctrine rests. Love, for him, not only constitutes the nature of God and the moral ideal of man, but is also the purpose and essence of all created being. Three poems, *James Lee's Wife*, *The Worst of It*, and *Confessions*, set forth the supreme value of love even in the face of estrangement, infidelity, and impending death respectively. Three others, *Youth and Art*, *Dis Aliter Visum*, and *Too Late*, arraign the sin of suppressing love through cowardice or calculating worldly wisdom, and so blighting the development of the soul.

The *Epilogue* sums up the volume. In it, Browning sets forth in dramatic monologues two of the outstanding faiths of the day and then answers them in thirty-six short lines which contain the master-arguments of his philosophy.

The first speaker is given as David. The scene pictured is the dedication of Solomon's temple in *Second Chronicles*, chapter 5:

The Levites, being arrayed in white linen, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them an hundred and twenty priests; and it came to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever; that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God.

The very few critics, such as Berdoe and Mrs. Orr, who have commented on the poem, take this first monologue literally. It represents, they say, the conception of God as the Old Testament David had it, as a terrible, all-glorious Deity who revealed Himself to His chosen people on certain extraordinary occasions as a cloud or a pillar of fire. But there are certain difficulties in the way of this interpretation. At the time of the dedication of the temple, here depicted, King David had been seventeen years dead. Browning, too, often enunciates the gradual development of man's re-



ligious conceptions as a perfectly natural process, in which the highest conceptions of any age are right for that age. David's views present the highest point reached by the purest Theism of the Hebrew people, yet Browning, in the third section of the *Epilogue*, rebukes him as "*witless alike of will and way divine.*" The poet would hardly waste time in 1864 A. D. condemning David for holding in 1000 B. C. views which he himself has often declared to be justified in that day. A further complication arises from the fact that in the poem *Saul*, published in 1855, he had already bestowed on David the views of the *third* speaker of the *Epilogue*.

There seems no doubt to my mind that in this first section of the *Epilogue* Browning has set forth, symbolically, a point of view which was finding acute expression in England at the time he wrote this poem, namely, the intense sacerdotalism of the Oxford Movement and the Church of Rome. To such superlatively orthodox Christians, our knowledge of the Divine is gained through special revelation; God's will is manifested in His church; and in the "sacred" edifices, with their priestly services and sanctified ceremonial, we come into the Holy of Holies, into the presence of the glory of the Lord.

As the first speaker expresses the faith of reactionary orthodoxy, so the second speaker gives us the conclusions of despairing scepticism to which a frank recognition of modern advances in knowledge seemed to drive the sincere but broadminded Christians of the day. The spokesman here is Renan, perhaps France's greatest scholar during the century, whose rationalistic *Vie de Jésus* had caused a tremendous stir at its publication in 1863.

Renan did not seek to overthrow Christianity. He attempted rather "to serve religion by trying to carry it into the region of the unassailable, beyond particular dogmas and supernatural beliefs." The general conclusions to which he was driven, however, were those of a grave Stoic pessimism, and are so represented by Browning in the second section of the *Epilogue*. His speech there may be roughly paraphrased as follows: Christ, here symbolized by the Biblical Star of Bethlehem, came to man as a new conception full of infinite hope and promise. There was no longer a great gulf fixed between the nature of man and the nature of God, for here the Divine seemed to stoop and touch the human

and to thrill to the fervent love of man's heart. But man fails to preserve this fervor and this vision. His conception of the personal, loving nature of God in Christ changes to that of a Divine Being, distant and omnipotent, unmoved by any feeling for our natures and infirmities. The next natural step, on the extension of our knowledge of the infinity of the universe, is the denial of even this superhuman deity. Man is left alone, a spiritual orphan. There are many lights in the world which he may study, many phases of scientific truth. But how shall Science take the place of the incarnate God who came to earth? With the death of Christianity and the dethronement of the Deity, man finds himself the highest form of life in the world; but the greatest thinkers, on realizing this, are appalled, for man instinctively wants something to which he can look up. Hence even the highest types of mankind find this abolition of the Divine repugnant and hateful.

Renan thus shows disillusionment as to special revelation, along with regret for the lost ideal. He assumes that in years to come men will resign themselves to uncertainty and at last will confront the eternal problems of religion with scarcely an effort for their solution. It is the modern savant's despair of discovering the truth about the spiritual world. Religious aspiration and emotion are all that can be ours, and all effort after a systematic knowledge of the unseen world must be abandoned in despair.

Such, then, are the two typical views set forth: David's representing that of the orthodox reactionaries who embraced revealed religion and the Church without any concern for truth, and Renan's that of the baffled liberal Christian who has sought to reconcile reason and religion.

To both of these speakers Browning delivers a sweeping rebuke. "Friends," he says, "you are blankly ignorant of God's will and God's ways. I have heard your views. Now listen to my explanation of it all."

"Heaven's high," he proceeds, "does intertwine with earth's low." The life of the universe is a manifestation of God, slowly expressing itself under aspects that press back towards the Divine. God is immanent in man and is likewise the character towards which he strives in his age-long process of development. It is not to abstract mankind in general that we must turn to realize this,

but to the individual. Every man, even the humblest and most insignificant, has his unique personality, differing from every other, in which this spiritual principle is working itself out. As, in legends, Arctic currents gathered around some point of rock, giving it momentary importance, and then swept over it and on to another, so the forces of the world, evil and good, gather round each man, shaping by their influence the development of the spiritual essence within him, until "*the life, his product*" is "*gained*." This sustained strife of spiritual forces goes forward incessantly, evolving the nature of God in mankind; yet it is not a vast impersonal process, a great chemical action in which men are only inert molecules, for the individual lives with their distinct individual characters and experiences are the medium through which the evolution goes on.

Thus Browning declares to the Churchman that God's presence is not limited to the buildings of brick and stone within which man has tried to confine Him; nor is His worship peculiarly served by ritual and ceremony. For God is actually present in His universe; He is the principle that gives it life and meaning; and the strenuous moral activity and spiritual growth of man are the highest forms of worship, for thereby comes the progressive realization of potential divinity.

And to the sceptic liberal, he declares that a calm survey of the universe does not wipe out the conception of God given us by Christ. For God is incarnate, potentially, in all mankind, and as man develops, the nature of God, the ideal towards which he strives, becomes more and more evident through the evolving nature of humanity. The incomplete knowledge and faltering love of mankind are revelations of the complete knowledge and perfect love of God:

That one Face, far from vanish, rather grows,  
Or decomposes but to recompose,  
Become my universe that feels and knows.

*Wesley College, Winnipeg, Canada.*

---

MIDNIGHTS MEDITATIONS (1646). A BIBLIO-  
GRAPHICAL PUZZLE

By C. A. MOORE

As religiosity rose to high-tide in the seventeenth century, English poets became more generally obsessed than before with the notion that the most befitting subject for poetical treatment was death—death in its most gruesome and moving circumstances. This morbid ideal is stamped upon most of the literature of the time, from the bottom of the poetical scale to the top. Quantitatively at least all previous efforts were surpassed in 1640 by *A Buckler against the Fear of Death; or Pious and Profitable Observations, and Consolations*, which has the distinction of being the longest poem of the kind in English and perhaps the most lugubrious. The hideous frontispiece—a medley of coffin, skull, skeleton, and other conventional *memento mori* devices—announces the book as the composition of “E. B. minister in G. B.”, and on the title-page that follows the initials E. B. are repeated. John Payne Collier gave a complete description of the volume and hazarded the conjecture that it was the work of Edward Browne.<sup>1</sup> Corser merely repeated this conjecture.<sup>2</sup> The *Dictionary of National Biography*, however, includes it among the productions of Edward Benlowes, and the Catalogue of the British Museum assigns it (tentatively) to Edward Barker, of Caius College, Cambridge.

Apparently it has escaped the notice of bibliographers that *Midnights Meditations of Death: With Pius and Profitable Observations, and Consolations* (1646)—a work curiously suggestive of Young’s *Night Thoughts* in title as well as substance—is nothing more than a reissue of *A Buckler against the Fear of Death*—from the same plates, but under a new title and without the original frontispiece and Dedication. *Midnights Meditations* is described on the title-page as “Perused by Francis Quarles a little

<sup>1</sup> *Bridgewater Catalogue*, 1837, p. 41; rptd. in *A Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language*, 1866, I, 119-121.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, 1860-83, VIII, 309.

before his Death," "Published by E. B.", and printed by John Macock. Misconstruing the first two of these phrases, Watt<sup>3</sup> assigned the authorship to Quarles, and was followed in this error by Lowndes<sup>4</sup> and Hazlitt.<sup>5</sup> The divine Quarles was mentioned, of course, for the purpose of advertisement. The author was E. B. This time the initials are explained in the Catalogue of the British Museum as those of Edward Benlowes.

In 1650 the same book was issued a third time under still another title, *Death Dis-sected: or, a Fort against Misfortune in a Cordiall, compounded of many pious and profitable Meditations on Mans Mortalitie*. This came out as the production of T. J., whose full name, Thomas Jordan, was attached to a very fulsome Epistle Dedicatory. In view of this work, Grosart decided in his edition of Quarles<sup>6</sup> that Watt and Hazlitt had necessarily been wrong in attributing *Midnights Meditations* to Quarles. All that Quarles had to do with it, he concluded, was to "peruse" the volume, the real author being the hack-writer Jordan. In reaching this conclusion, Grosart evidently misunderstood the phrase "Published by E. B." as Watt and Hazlitt had done. Although this was not an uncommon way of indicating the authorship of a book, he must have taken the phrase in the modern sense and therefore assumed that *Midnights Meditations* came out anonymously. He thus prepared himself to accept Jordan's claim to the authorship as *bona fide*. Surely Grosart did not know the character of the City Poet so well as we might have expected of him. Jordan's part is now generally recognized; he annexed to his credit this performance as he did various other works that bear his name.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Robert Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica*, 1824, I, 785 m.

<sup>4</sup> W. T. Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual*, 1864, III, 2022.

<sup>5</sup> W. Carew Hazlitt, *Hand-Book*, 1867, p. 493.

<sup>6</sup> *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Francis Quarles*, 1880, Memorial Introduction, xxxi-xxxiii.

<sup>7</sup> *Death Dis-sected* was unknown to Watt (see "Death"). Hazlitt includes it among the works of Thomas Jordan (*Collections and Notes*, 1876, p. 241. It is there dated 1649, and in Gray's Index to Hazlitt, 1864). Whether the bibliographer had examined the volume or not, he evidently did not detect Jordan's plagiarism. Collier (who seems not to have known *Midnights Meditations*) concludes his description of *A Buckler against the Fear of Death*: "It is worth noting, that Thomas Jordan made use of some waste copies of this book to defraud such as

When we realize that the three books are identical in text, one fact is clear: the versifier E. B. published, in 1640, a volume of solemn mortuary sentiment which has served to enhance the reputation of Quarles, Benlowes, Barker, Browne, and Jordan for piety, if not for poetry, and left his own identity unrevealed. There is little to recommend any of the various conjectures of authorship that have since been advanced. Benlowes was thought of partly because the author of *Theophila* was addicted to the most doleful verse, partly because he was a friend of the peruser Quarles. If all other objections were removed, there would still remain the impossibility of explaining why he should call himself "minister in G. B." The case for Edward Barker is quite as weak. Even if we accept Calamy's statement that Barker "had a peculiar fancy for divine poetry, and completed a book of it in imitation of Mr. Herbert"—a work which nobody has ever been able to discover—he could hardly have qualified for *A Buckler against the Fear of Death* in 1640. Barker entered Caius College, Cambridge, in the Easter term of 1637 at the age of sixteen and took his Bachelor's degree in 1640-41.<sup>8</sup> It is unlikely that this prolonged *meditatio mortis* was composed by an undergraduate in his teens, even an undergraduate at Cambridge in the seventeenth century. Both the poem and the Dedication argue years of maturity. Afterwards Barker was minister at Eye; but in 1640, during his senior year at college, he was probably not a "minister in G. B." or elsewhere. Collier's guess rests upon firmer ground. We at least know that there was a minor poet named Edward Browne writing verse at this time. In 1642 he published *A rare Paterne of Justice and Mercy; exemplified in the many notable and Charitable Legacies of Sir James Cambel, Kt., etc.*, to which are appended several poems. Obviously, however, Browne gives a full account of him-

would pay him for dedications: he printed a new title to it without date, calling it 'Death Dissected, or a Fort against Misfortune,' and palmed it off upon the unsuspecting as his own composition. . . . Jordan was unquestionably a great trickster in these matters; but he had usually the excuse of what Chaucer calls 'a hateful good'-poverty.' (*loc. cit.*) Grosart would have been less easily deceived if he had known of the original (1640) work.

<sup>8</sup> John Venn, *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1897*, I, 327. Venn quotes from Calamy (II, 420) the reference to Barker's poetical talent.

self, and it goes to show conclusively that he was never at any time a clergyman. It is a matter for surprise that the honor has never been conferred upon Edward Bagshaw, especially since he sometimes used the expression "Published by E. B." and had local connections in Northamptonshire as the author of the original Dedication seems to have had. But here again "minister in G. B." would be unaccountable.

My own conjecture is that the author of the original work followed a practice very common at the time by punning upon his name in the title, that *A Buckler against the Fear of Death* was the production of the clergyman Edward Buckler, who matriculated at Oriel College, Oxford, June 20, 1628, aged eighteen,<sup>9</sup> and was therefore thirty years old in 1640. Of his later life there is the following account in Calamy's *Nonconformist's Memorial*<sup>10</sup> in connection with the Puritan clergymen of Hampshire who were ejected from their livings at the Restoration:

He was much the gentleman, a good preacher, and a good writer. He had been one of *Oliver Cromwell's* chaplain's, and preached before him four times a year, for which he received 20 l. After he was ejected he lived privately at *Bradford Abbas*, in Dorset, where he followed the business of malting, and preached but seldom; except in and about the year 1672, at a gentleman's house, where few if any were admitted beside the family. He frequently attended at the public church.

Calamy's account throws no light whatever on Buckler's activities until long after the year 1640, and the mere remark that he was "a good writer" is of slight evidential value. Moreover, there seems to be only the thinnest evidence that Buckler published at all. We do know, however, that in 1647 he collaborated with another minister in a controversial tract called

*Certaine Queries concerning the lawfullness of imposing  
and taking of the Negative Oath, Propounded by some  
Ministers under Restraint in the Garrison of Weymouth,*  
and answered

By	{	E. B. and P. I.	}	Ministers of	{	Weymouth and Melcomb-regis.	}
----	---	-----------------------	---	--------------	---	-----------------------------------	---

At any rate, we now have an E. B. who is a *minister* and who so

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, etc., 1888 ("Buckler, Edward, gent").

<sup>10</sup> 1802-03, II, 262.

designates himself on the title-page of his publication. In 1647 Buckler was located at Weymouth. Where he was seven years earlier, when the *Buckler* was published, I have been unable to discover; but I suspect he was then "minister in G. B." The dropping of this description from the 1646 issue means only that he had now left his living at G. B., as we know he had done by 1647.

The mere fact that we have no acknowledged specimens of his verse is no proof that he wrote none. Poetry was still looked upon with grave suspicion by many good Englishmen, especially clergymen of the Puritan faction. Buckler would have no great desire to advertise his relations with the Muse. Although much worse religious rhyme was written in the seventeenth century, there is no reason for supposing that a man of Buckler's reputed intelligence could not have turned off, at the age of thirty, a fat volume of stanzas of which the following selection from *Meditation I* is a fair specimen:

If I must dye, I'll catch at every thing  
That may but mind me of my latest breath,  
Deaths-heads, graves, knells, blacks, tombs, all those  
shall bring,

Into my soul such useful thoughts of death,  
That this sable King of fears,  
Though in chiefest of my health  
He behind me come by stealth,  
Shall not catch me unawares.

When-e're I visit any dying friend,  
Each sigh and scrich, and every death-bed grone  
Shall reade me such a lecture of mine end,  
That I'll suppose his case will be mine own.  
As this poore man here doth lie  
Rack'd all o're with deadly pain,  
Never like to rise again,  
Time will come when so must I.

Thus ghastly shall I look, thus every part  
Of me shall suffer, thus my lips shall shrivel,  
My teeth shall grin, and thus my drooping heart  
Shall smoke out sighs and grones; and all the evil  
Which I see man lye under,  
What sinne earns and death doth pay,  
I shall feel another day.  
Sinne from torment who can sunder?



Thus will my mournfull friends about me come:  
 My livelesse carcase shall be stretched out.  
 I must be packing to my longest home:  
 Thus will the mourners walk the streets about.  
     Thus for me the bells will toll:  
     Thus must I bid all adieu,  
     World, and wife, and children too:  
     Thus must I breathe out my soul.

At other fun'ralls when I see a grave,  
 That grave shall mind me of mortalitie.  
 I'll think that such a lodging I must have:  
 Thus in the pit my bones must scattered lie;  
     Here one bone and there another,  
     Here my ribs, and there my skull,  
     And my mouth of earth be full.  
 I must call the worms my mother.

This is undoubtedly miserable stuff. And yet Benlowes, Quarles, or any of the other writers to whom it was then ignorantly assigned need not have felt dishonored by the imputed authorship. Possibly the substitution of a new title for the second issue may mean that the printer was finding it difficult to dispose of his stock. But in itself this fact would not signify that the performance was rated low by the public. It came out at the time when excitement over the meeting of the Long Parliament rendered Englishmen comparatively indifferent to every kind of writing except ecclesiastical and political controversy. Jordan had a keen sense for popular values. It means much that he saw fit to revive the work when the occasion seemed more propitious, the year after the triumph of Puritanism over royalty. No volume of the time is more typical of vulgar taste in poetry. The writer presented on a gigantic, an exhaustive, scale what others undertook piecemeal. In execution his work is inferior to Henry Vaughan's *The Charnel-House* (1651);<sup>11</sup> yet the two poems are identical in spirit. In the same spirit Thomas Flatman, in a sense the last of this school of vermicular poets, one who was to carry over into the Restoration a somewhat attenuated form of the melancholy habit, composed his *Dooms-Day Thought*. Anno. 1659.<sup>12</sup> Flatman was looked upon

<sup>11</sup> In *Olor Iscanus*. Works, ed. Grosart, II, 75.

<sup>12</sup> *Poems and Songs*, 4th ed., 1686, p. 76.

as a real poet, and his poem is a distinct step towards Young and Gray; but how slight the difference between *A Buckler against the Fear of Death* and the solemn piety of Flatman's

Go to the dull Church-yard and see  
Those Hillocks of Mortality.  
Where proudest Man is only found  
By a small swelling in the Ground?  
What crowds of Carcasses are made  
Slaves to the Pickax and the Spade!  
Dig but a foot, or two, to make  
A Cold Bed, for thy dead Friends sake,  
Tis odds but in that scantling room,  
Thou robb'st another of his Tomb,  
Or in thy delving smit'st upon  
A shinbone, or a Cranion.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

## DID CHRÉTIEN IDENTIFY THE GRAIL WITH THE MASS?

BY ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

So far as is known Chrétien's *Perceval*, written about 1175, contains the first mention of the Grail, and all other Grail stories are based on this account. Many books on the origin of the Grail have been written, but nobody has yet edited this first Grail romance upon which everything else rests. We have today no exact idea of what Chrétien wrote.

Sixteen Mss. of Chrétien's *Perceval* are known: 9 in France, 1 in Belgium, 2 in Switzerland, 1 in Italy, 2 in London, and 1 in Edinburgh. One of these Mss., that at Mons in Belgium, has been printed by Potvin in an edition of 300 copies, of which Northwestern University has one. Another Ms., that called Cangé (Paris 794), has been privately printed in a small edition for his seminar students by Professor Baist.<sup>1</sup> He gave me a copy of this private reprint.

<sup>1</sup> A reissue of this with notes and glossary exists, G. Ragoczy, Freiburg, n. d. [1912].

All students of the Grail hitherto have been content to base upon these two Mss. their knowledge of what Chrétien wrote and this in spite of their being aware that other Mss. diverge somewhat widely. The late Professor Foerster once remarked that these divergences were perhaps great enough to make a critical edition of the romance impossible.

Chrétien twice describes the Grail at some length: first when Perceval saw it at the castle of the Fisher King,<sup>2</sup> and again when Perceval related to his cousin what he had seen.<sup>3</sup> In neither of these passages does Chrétien attach the slightest Christian coloring to the Grail. Some critics, indeed, have thought that the procession at the Grail castle must be borrowed from the processions of the church. This is not probable. Not every procession comes from the church service, and this procession, which includes several women (the Grail was carried by a beautiful girl) is most unlike any of the usual processions of the church.

The only place, therefore, in which Chrétien indicates any connection whatsoever between the Grail and the Mass occurs near the end of his unfinished *Perceval* at a point 2800 verses after the longer accounts of the Grail. Here a Christian explanation of the Grail is put into the mouth of a hermit who turns out to be Perceval's uncle.

The passage is a trifle corrupt in the Mss. which are printed by Potvin and Baist respectively, but a comparison of a third Ms., Paris 12,577, which I have consulted in a rotograph belonging to the Modern Language Association, has enabled me, as I hope, to grasp the sense of every verse.

After having been reproached for riding in armor on Good Friday, Perceval went to confess to a hermit, and told him, among other things, that he had seen the Grail. The hermit's reply contains the following verses:

"He whom one serves with it (i. e., the Grail) is my brother."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Baist, vv. 3180 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vv. 3518 f.

<sup>4</sup> Paris Ms. 12,577, folios 37-8

Cil qui on en sert est mes freres  
Ma suer et soie fu ta mere  
E du riche pescheur croi

Ed. Baist, 6377-6393

Cil cui lan an sert fu mes frere  
Ma suer e soe fu ta mere  
E del riche pescheor roi

My sister and his was your mother.  
 And of the Rich Fisher, I believe  
 That he is son to that king  
 Who makes himself served with the Grail.  
 But do not think that he has  
 Luce or lamprey or salmon  
 With a single *oiste*, this we know,  
 That one brings to him in this Grail  
 He sustains and comforts his life.  
 So holy a thing is the Grail  
 And it is so spiritual,  
 That he needs for his life nothing more  
 Than the *oiste* that comes in the Grail.  
 Fifteen years he has been so  
 That he has not gone out of the chamber  
 Where you saw the Grail enter."

Of course the word "*oiste*," which occurs twice within seven verses of this passage, absolutely identifies the Grail with the Mass. "*Oiste*" can be nothing else than the Latin word *hostia* which means the sacrifice, or the consecrated wafer. If this passage be genuine, no doubt can exist that Chrétien identified Grail and Mass.

For a number of years I have suspected the word "*oiste*" in this passage to be an interpolation. So far back as 1916 I ex-

---

Paris Ms.

Q'il est filz a celui roy  
 Q' du graal servir se fait  
 Mes ne cuide pas que il ait  
 Luz ne lamproie ne saumon  
 Se d'une seule oette non  
 Q' on en ce graal li porte

Sa vie en soustient et conforte  
 Tant sainte chose est li greaus  
 Et al est tant esperitaus  
 Q'a sa vie plus nen couvioit  
 Q'loiste qui du greal vient

Xx ans a la estre ains  
 E hors de la chambre nissi  
 Ou le graal veil entrer.

Baist

Qui filz est a celui ce croi  
 Qui del graal servir se fait  
 E ne cuidiez pas que il ait  
 Luz ne lamproies ne saumons  
 D'une seule oiste ce savons  
 Que l'an an ce graal aporte

Sa vie sostient e conforte:  
 Tant sainte chose est li graax  
 E tant par est esperitax  
 Que sa vie plus ne sostient  
 Que l'oiste qui el graal vient

Quinze anz a ja esté ensi  
 Que hors de la chanbre n'issi  
 Ou le graal veis antrer.

pressed in print my doubts about this word.<sup>5</sup> My theory is that some copyist, full of the idea that the Grail was the cup of the Mass, inserted into Chrétien's verses the word "*oïste*" in order to bring them into harmony with the belief of his day.

My theory is not especially daring. Several Mss. of the *Perceval* (Paris 794, 1429, 12577, and Montpellier 249) in a later visit made by Gawain to the Grail castle, contain interpolated verses which explain that the Grail is the cup of Joseph of Arimathea.<sup>6</sup> This explanation has been recognized by everybody as an interpolation, because it contradicts the whole point of the episode which is that Gawain left the castle without learning the meaning of the Grail. We know, therefore, that copyists have interpolated ecclesiastical explanations into our Mss. of the *Perceval*, although hitherto no interpolation has been detected in Chrétien's part of the romance. Why should we believe that they always respected Chrétien's part of the text, which is in the same Mss., and was copied by the same hands?

If Chrétien had meant to connect the Grail with the Mass he would, I think, have given us some hint of the matter in his earlier

---

Ed. Potvin, 7789-7805

Cil cui l'en sert, il est mes frère,  
Ma suer et soie fu ta mère,  
Et del rice Pescéour croi

Que il est fuis à celui roi  
Qui del Graal servir se fait;  
Mais ne quidiés pas que il ait  
Lus ne lamproie ne saumon;  
D'une sole oïste li sains hom  
Quant en ce Gréal li aporte,

Sa vie sostient et conforte,  
Tant sainte cose est li Graaus;  
Et cil est si esperitaus  
K'à sa vie plus ne covient  
Que l'oïste qui el Gréal vient.

Xx ans i a estet ensi  
Que fors de la cambre n'issi  
U le Gréal véis entrer.

<sup>5</sup> *Modern Philology*, xiv, 402.

<sup>6</sup> See Potvin's edition, iv, 5, vv. 20, 295 f., and notes.

and more detailed accounts. It is not in the style of Chrétien—in fact not in the style of anybody having the slightest artistic ability—after repeatedly picturing the Grail in a purely secular way, and after a verse which mentions several kinds of fish (luce, lamprey, salmon) abruptly to introduce a word with such high ecclesiastical associations as “*oïste*.” Had Chrétien meant to identify the Grail with the Mass he would not have made the connection in such a brief and casual way, and would not have left a matter of such importance to depend merely on a single word. It is a more reasonable hypothesis, and more respectful to Chrétien as an artist, to suppose that these verses in the speech of the hermit have been tampered with. If we reject these seven verses as spurious we shall restore complete consistency to Chrétien’s various accounts of the Grail. Everywhere except in these few verses he describes it as a purely secular talisman.

Until a few months ago I could offer no tangible evidence in support of my theory. The three accessible Mss. all contain the word “*oïste*.” The Flemish version gives at this place the word “*oïste*.” Wolfram’s *Parzival*, too, seems to indicate that the German poet followed an original with this reading.

The object of the present paper is to call attention to a passage in the prose version of *Perceval* that was printed at Paris in 1530. This variant passage has escaped the attention of all students of the Grail story. The prose of 1530 has been accessible only at Paris and London. Last year the Modern Language Association through its committee procured a rotograph of the entire book which is deposited at the Library of Congress. From this rotograph I have transcribed the variant passage to which I call your attention. This passage makes Chrétien’s presentation of the Grail consistent, and eliminates all reference to the Mass. It agrees almost exactly with the three Mss. that we know, except in the suspicious verses. The passage is as follows:

Perceval has wandered for five years without thinking of God. After having been rebuked one day for riding in warlike trappings on Good Friday, he went to confess to a hermit. The hermit said to him, among other things: <sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Perceval* printed in 1530, folio 35:

“Je te diray croy a certes que celluy qui du Graal on sert est mon frere

"I tell you believe certainly that the person whom one serves with the Grail is my brother. My sister and his was your mother, and the king of rich fishers is son to that man who causes himself to be served with the Grail. And do not fancy that there is luce, lamprey, carp, salmon, or any other fish in this Grail, but the Grail is so worthy and precious, that by the power that is in it, solely by carrying it, the Fisher King sustains and comforts his life. Twelve years has this king been so that he has not issued at all out of the chamber where you saw the Lance and the Grail."

This passage says that the Grail does not contain any fish, which seems to imply, either that it looked like a receptacle for fish, or that some well known story made it contain fish. The Grail is not called "holy," but "worthy," and "precious"—that is it is an object worth having, evidently a talisman of some kind because the old man has been sustained for twelve years merely by touching it. The old man is not said to be practising religious abstinence: the impression would rather be that he is in a trance, or a death-in-life condition, such as is occasionally met with in fairy tales. No connection between the Grail and the Mass is indicated, or even suggested.

Somebody may object: What significance can the prose version of 1530 have, since it was not printed till 350 years after the first Grail romance was written by Chrétien? My point is that this prose of 1530 may bear witness to the original text of Chrétien and may testify that he did not identify the Grail with the Mass.

So far as I can learn the prose of 1530 is not based upon any of the Mss. now known to exist. It rests upon some lost Ms.—presumably upon one that in 1530 was regarded as one of the best and most complete. Possibly, therefore, it truly represents what Chrétien wrote. If so, Chrétien nowhere made any identification or connection between the Grail and the Mass. For him it was a secular talisman.

ma seur et la sienne fut ta mere et des riches pescheurs le Roy est cestuy filz/ qui du Graal servir se faict. Et ne cuide pas quil y ait luz lamproie carpe saulmon ne quelque aultre poysson qui soit en ce Graal/ mais tant digne est/ et precieux que par la vertu que en luy est seullement en le portant le Roy Peschor sousstient sa vie et le conforte douze ans ce Roy ainsy a este qui hors de la chambre nest de parfoiy issu ou tu la lance et le Graal veis."

Some one may inquire: How do we know that the translator of 1530 was in this place following any Ms? May he not have invented this special passage?

The hypothesis of invention by the translator of 1530 is very improbable because:

1. He nowhere else omits anything, nor does he add anything of importance except an occasional moral reflection at the beginning of various chapters. In the passage in question he adds another fish "carp" to the list which appears in the accessible verse Mss. as "luce, lamprey, and salmon." This might be an accident, but since we can think of no reason why, contrary to his custom, a prose redactor should add at this point, it is probable that we have in this additional fish a trace that he was not inventing but following a different Ms. from any that we know.

2. If he was not following a Ms. no reason can be assigned why he should have eliminated the Christian references. He was as familiar with the Christian explanation of the Grail as we are. Always in the headings which he supplies to chapters and in several other places (doubtless by inadvertence), he uses the phrase "Holy Grail," an expression never met with in the verse of Chrétien. Such a man could have no object in omitting the Christian references as they stand in the Mss. that we know.

Moreover this passage in the prose of 1530 agrees so completely with the descriptions of the Grail given elsewhere, by Chrétien that it can scarcely be the invention of a late redactor. Instead of the adjectives applied to the Grail in the suspected seven verses: "sainte" and "esperitaus" which imply some sort of sacred association, the prose has the unecclesiastical epithets "digne" and "precieux." Thus it keeps the whole passage beginning with the mention of several kinds of fish in the same key, and makes it read like the work of an artist such as Chrétien was. There is here no connection between Grail and Mass.

Somebody may object that Perceval's coming to the Hermit on Good Friday, implies an identification of Grail and Mass. Observe, however, that it is not that the Grail first appears or ever appears on Good Friday, but (quite a different thing) that Perceval goes to confession to a hermit on Good Friday and there learns of the meaning of the Grail. Chrétien had to represent his hero as going to confession on some sacred day. His selection of Good Friday



is appropriate enough anyway, and need not imply any identification between Grail and Mass.

I am perfectly well aware how far this paper comes short of upsetting the popular belief that Chrétien has identified Grail and Mass. I believe, however, that the paper has been worth writing in order to show how slight a foundation this belief has, and how absolutely necessary it is for us to get access to all Mss. of *Perceval*, before dogmatizing about what Chrétien said.

*Northwestern University.*

---

## NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

---

### MONSTER-SPAWNING NILE-MUD IN SPENSER

No lover of Spenser can forget the monster-spawning Nile-mud of Canto I in the first book of the *Faerie Queene*:

As when old father Nilus gins to swell  
With timely pride above the Aegyptian vale  
His fattie waves doe fertile slime outwell,  
And overflow each plaine and lowly dale:  
But when his later spring gins to avale,  
Huge heapes of mudd he leaves, wherein there breed  
Ten thousand kindes of creatures, partly male  
And partly female of his fruitful seed;  
Such ugly monstrous shapes elswher may no man reed.

Spenser himself seems to have been impressed with the strange fancy; for in III, vi he again gives it utterance, making it illustrative, this time, of a general doctrine:

But reason teacheth that the fruitful seades  
Of all things living, through impression  
Of the sunbeames in moyst complexion,  
Doe life conceive and quickned are by kynd:  
So, after Nilus inundation,  
Infinite shapes of creatures men doe fynd  
Informed in the mud on which the Sunne hath shynd.

Indeed, *slime* becomes synonymous, for him, with *bodily substance*, and is repeatedly used in this sense. Thus:

All were they borne of her owne native slime. (II, x)  
Had she not beene devoide of mortall slime. (III, iv)

The chief source of these ideas, especially as regards the specific allusions to the mud of the Nile, is to be found in the *Historical Library* of Diodorus Siculus.

As for the general doctrine, Spenser must have been familiar with it in the Greek and Roman philosophers. Thus Anaximenes "introduced the idea of primordial terrestrial slime, a mixture of earth and water, from which, under the influence of the sun's

heat, plants, animals, and human beings were directly produced.”<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, indeed, in one passage, strongly reminds us of the stanza immediately following that quoted from *F. Q.* III, VI, and beginning:

Great father he of generation  
Is rightly cald, th’ authour of life and light.

The passage occurs in *Generation of Animals* (I, II):

For by a male animal we mean that which generates in another, and by a female that which generates in itself; wherefore men apply these terms to the macrocosm also, naming earth *mother* as being female, but addressing heaven and the sun and other like entities as fathers, as causing generation.

In the same way, Lucretius calls to mind the stanza in Canto I and the “loathly frogs and toades, which eyes did lacke” of the preceding stanza when, in the fifth book of his great poem, he says:

Hence, doubtless, Earth, prodigious forms at first  
Gendered, of face and members most grotesque:  
Monsters half-man, half-woman, not from each  
Distant, yet neither total; shapes unsound,  
Footless and handless, void of mouth or eye.

So much for the general doctrine. As for the specific allusions to the mud of the Nile, many possible sources might be thought of; but, as we shall now see, only one of them is entirely satisfactory. Herodotus<sup>2</sup> merely remarks that the small-fry swarming in pools which form as the flood approaches probably hatch from eggs deposited in the mud the year before. Strabo<sup>3</sup> attributes the fecundity of Egyptian women to their drinking Nile-water, and quotes Aristotle as defending a similar view on the ground of “the moderate coction effected” in the water “by the sun’s rays.” Pliny<sup>4</sup> and Seneca<sup>5</sup> assert that the water promotes fertility in women who drink of it. Aelian<sup>6</sup> says the same in regard to

<sup>1</sup> H. F. Osborn, *From The Greeks to Darwin*.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, *History*, Book II, Chap. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, *Geography*, Book XV, Chap. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Pliny, *Natural History*, Book VII, Chap. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Seneca, *Natur. Quaest.*, Book III, Chap. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Aelian, *De Animal.*, Book III, Chap. 33.

Egyptian goats. Solinus,<sup>7</sup> Isidore,<sup>8</sup> and Leo Africanus<sup>9</sup> merely remark that the river fertilizes the soil. Albertus Magnus<sup>10</sup> says that the Nile "breeds monsters." None of these, surely, can be regarded as furnishing the source of Spenser's lines. Four others, instead, have considerably more to say. I shall discuss them in inverse order to the importance of their contributions.

Heliodorus, in the ninth book of his *Ethiopics*, has the following passage:

The Egyptians deify the Nile, making him one of their principal gods, and equalling him to heaven; because they say that without clouds or rain he annually waters and fertilizes their fields. This is the opinion of the vulgar. They consider it a proof of his divinity that, the union of moist and dry being the principal cause of animal life, he supplies the former, the earth the latter quality (admitting the existence also of other elements).

This passage has been given<sup>11</sup> as the source of the stanza in Canto I. Were it so, we should have to consider Spenser's monster-spawning Nile-mud as chiefly the creation of his own fancy. Here is no clear assertion of spontaneous generation; nor is there any mention of the slime of the Nile.

In the thirteenth book of *Batman uppon Bartholome*, we find the following, quoted verbatim from Cooper's *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae*:

Nilus was famous for the vertue of the water thereof which overflowing the country of Aegipt made ye ground wonderfull fertill many yeares after; so that without labouring ye earth brought forth abundance of sundry graines and plants delectable and profitable. Also beastes of sundry kindes without other forme of generation.

This, assuredly, is more to the purpose. But here again there is no mention of slime: it is the earth, not the "huge heapes of mudd he leaves," that we are told about. Besides, as we shall presently see, the passage in Diodorus Siculus is incomparably more striking and picturesque; and the scholarly poet was quite

<sup>7</sup> Solinus, *Rerum Mem.*, Section XXXVII.

<sup>8</sup> Isidore, *De Originum*, Book XIII, Chap. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Leo Africanus, *A Geog. Hist. of Africa*, "General Description."

<sup>10</sup> Albertus Magnus, *De Natura Locorum*, Treatise III, Chap. 6.

<sup>11</sup> *The Faerie Queene, Book I, with Introd. and Notes by H. M. Percival*. Macmillan, 1899.

as likely to be familiar with the *Historical Library* as with Batman or Cooper.

Mela, in the ninth chapter of the first book of his *De Situ Orbis*, has a passage that certainly does not lack in vividness; indeed, it is probably derived from that in Diodorus. The passage runs as follows:

Overflowing in summer, it irrigates the soil, and nourishes it with waters so efficacious in generating that the river swarms with fish and produces huge beasts such as the hippopotamus and the crocodile. It infuses life into the fields also, and fashions living creatures out of the earth. That such is the case is evident; for where the flood lay and then withdrew one may behold in the soaked fields animals that, not yet perfect but rather in the act of receiving life, appear partly formed and partly still of earth.

Here indeed we have a striking resemblance, but we shall presently feel convinced, I think, that not Mela but his original was uppermost in Spenser's mind when the lines we are discussing were penned.

No one who reads the first book of the *Historical Library* is likely to forget it, for in it there occur descriptions of truly biblical power. In the seventh chapter, Diodorus, discussing the theories of the philosophers as to the origin of life upon earth, describes with graphic vividness what took place according to believers in spontaneous generation. He pictures the moist, soft land, newly withdrawn from the waters of the sea, swelling and as it were fermenting in the hot sunshine; till at length it breaks out into welts, and germinating in these, teems with multitudinous and varied life:

So the moisture of the earth was warmed into fruitfulness; and during the night the germs drew nourishment from the mist and fog in the air; and in the daytime they were brought to a solid consistency by the heat of the sun. At length, when the fetuses had reached maturity, the membranes inclosing them being now burnt up by the heat and broken, there came forth all kinds of animals.

In the tenth chapter, he relates how the Egyptians believed their country to be the cradle of the human race; for did not marvels of spontaneous generation still occur there? Yes:

Even at present, in the vicinity of Thebes, so many mice are generated, at certain times, that those who behold the spectacle are struck with great amazement. Some of these mice, formed only as far as the breast and forelegs, begin to move, even while the rest of their bodies, which has not yet put off the nature of mere earth, remains shapeless.

The Egyptians, he tells us, attributed this awe-inspiring peculiarity of their native land to their river, permeated with the life-giving warmth of the sun:

And indeed, they say that in our own times also, all over the irrigated Egyptian fields, you may perceive in the late waters creatures that have sprung from them. When the river recedes, you may behold, wherever first the sun dries the slime, animals—some perfect, some half-formed and still attached to the earth of the clod—hardening into solid consistency.<sup>12</sup>

Surely that "late waters," found in none of the other possible sources, is echoed in Spenser's "when his later spring gins to avale." Here, too, we have the slime, and "the mud on which the Sunne hath shynd"; here the clods which may well have suggested those "huge heapes of mudd" in Canto 1. If I am right, Spenser substituted his "partly male and partly female" for the "some perfect, some half-formed" of our passage. I believe, too, that the substitution was suggested to him by Lucretius; and I am confirmed in this belief by the further persuasion that he intended to describe the "loathly frogs and toades" as hermaphrodites,—an epithet of cruel aptness when aimed, as it probably was here, at skirted priests. Our passage does not account for the last line of the stanza in Canto 1; but in the same chapter Diodorus, referring to the Egyptian mice, says as follows:

While no such creatures are produced from the soil anywhere else, in Egypt alone, contrary to what usually happens, you behold little animals thus generated.

This statement, occurring as it does in the *Historical Library* alone, is, it seems to me, an added proof that Spenser had read the descriptions which I have been discussing.

C. W. LEMMI.

*Goucher College.*

---

<sup>12</sup> καθάπερ τινές φασι, παντελούς γενομένης τῶν ἐμψύχων φθορᾶς ἡ γῆ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς καινὰς ἤγεγε τῶν ζῴων φύσεις, ὅμως καὶ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον πρέπειν τὴν ἀρχηγὸν τῶν ἐμψύχων γένεσιν προσάπτειν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρῃ τῆς γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπομβρίας τῷ παρ' ἐαυτοῖς γινομένῃ καύμασι μεγέσσης εἰκὸς εὐκρατότατον γενέσθαι τὸν ἀέρα πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῶν πάντων ζωογονίαν. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἔτι χρόνοις κατὰ τὴν ἐπικλυδτον Αἰγυπτὸν ἐν τοῖς ὀψίμοις τῶν ὑδάτων φανερώς ὁτᾶσθαι γενομένους φύσεις ἐμψύχων· ὅταν γὰρ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν ποιουμένου τὴν πρώτην τῆς ἰλῦος ὁ ἥλιος διαξήρῃ, φασὶ συνίστασθαι ζῶα, τινὰ μὲν εἰς τέλος ἀπμρτισμένα, τινὰ δὲ ἡμιτελῆ καὶ πρὸς αὐτῇ συμφύῃ τῇ γῇ.—Diodorus I, 10, 4.

## MME DE SÉVIGNÉ AND LA FONTAINE

Biographers of Mme de Sévigné have all mentioned her admiration for La Fontaine. The editors of the Grands Ecrivains edition<sup>1</sup> of her letters have noted her frequent use of the fables and identified the references to them. We also know her opinions about the work of La Fontaine and other contemporaries.<sup>2</sup> Although this subject has been so fully treated, there appears to be no general interpretation of her use of the poet's work. It may be of interest to see just what fables she admired most and in what way she used La Fontaine's work.

Three fables, *Les deux Pigeons*, *Le Chêne et le Roseau*, and *l'Education* were apparently her favorites, for each is mentioned more than twice in her correspondence. *Les deux Pigeons* became a family term applicable to her children and used by them to designate each other: "Je reçois des lettres de votre frère qui ne me parlent que de son pigeon."<sup>3</sup> It is this intimate appeal that gives to the fable the honor of five references. She also used it to describe her son Charles, with the substitution of "dîner" for "souper" in the original line: "Votre frère me paroît avoir tout ce qu'il veut,

Bon dîner, bon gîte, et le reste."<sup>4</sup>

She used it several times to excuse the lack of news in her letters with the lines:

Quiconque ne voit guère  
N'a guère à dire aussi.<sup>5</sup>

*Le Chêne et le Roseau* had second place in her affection with four references. She made a witty use of the opening line in a letter to her daughter, denying that the visit of the young Marquis de Grignan would be a burden to her: "Laissez-moi la honte de trouver qu'un roitelet sur moi soit un pesant fardeau."<sup>6</sup> The end

<sup>1</sup> Paris, 1862.

<sup>2</sup> W. Loeffler, *Die literarischen Urteile der Frau von Sévigné nach ihren Briefen*. Heidelberg Dissertation. G. Otto, Darmstadt, 1912, p. 45-54.

<sup>3</sup> *Lettres*, édition Grands Ecrivains, vi, 22, Sept. 27, 29, 1679.

<sup>4</sup> vi, 15, Sept. 27, 1679.

<sup>5</sup> vi, 4, 360, Sept. 15, Apr. 19, 1679; ix, 435, Jan. 29, 1690.

<sup>6</sup> viii, 315, Dec. 10, 1688.

of the fable with the triumph of the frail reed and the overthrow of the sturdy oak by those "terribles enfants du Nord" is the subject of the other references in which she describes the rigors of a winter at Les Rochers and the fury of the high winds at Grignan.<sup>7</sup> For *l'Education* she had three distinct and different uses. She referred to it in her attempt to combat her son's attitude to court life,<sup>8</sup> later to portray Louvois's daughter, Mme de la Roche-Guyon,<sup>9</sup> and finally to describe two brothers, friends of Mme de Grignan, who seemed to be like the *César* and the *Laridon négligé* of the fable.<sup>10</sup>

Much of Mme de Sévigné's correspondence is concerned with her daughter's mode of living and her problems as mistress of a large establishment. She sent motherly advice and occasional criticism which were emphasized by humorous allusions to the *Fables*, the *Contes*, and sometimes to *Psyché*. She was frightened by the great crowd of retainers and the excessive expense at Grignan and besought her daughter with a line from *Le Renard ayant la queue coupée* to turn and dismiss this band.<sup>11</sup> The solitude of such a life passed in the midst of so much frivolity seemed to her like that of *Psyché* alone on the mountain.<sup>12</sup> Mme de Grignan's fears for her son then at the front are treated philosophically in a few lines taken from *Le Lièvre et les Grenouilles* where life is said to be "jamais un plaisir pur, toujours assauts divers" and fear a purely feminine weakness.<sup>13</sup> She noted the inexperience of her grandson when he visited her and recalled at once the fable of *La Chatte métamorphosée en Femme*.<sup>14</sup>

Reports of her own health and her occupations of the moment often end with a skillful application of a fable.<sup>15</sup> Not only were personal and family matters made more vivid by these citations but also scenes from social life. She sketched the *Princesse de*

<sup>7</sup> IX, 358, Dec. 18, 1689; 25, Apr. 19, 1689.

<sup>8</sup> VI, 30, Sept. 29, 1679.

<sup>9</sup> VI, 115, Dec. 1, 1679.

<sup>10</sup> IX, 239, Oct. 2, 1689.

<sup>11</sup> IX, 4, Apr. 1, 1689.

<sup>12</sup> II, 451, Dec. 30, 1671.

<sup>13</sup> VIII, 269, Nov. 17, 1688.

<sup>14</sup> VIII, 348, Dec. 22, 1688.

<sup>15</sup> III, 258, Nov. 2, 1673; IV, 243, Nov. 20, 1675.



Conti, after observing the king's tender affection for this favorite daughter, by the line from *Le Lion amoureux*:

Elle est toujours des grâces le modèle.<sup>16</sup>

The marriage of Mlle Louvois recalled La Fontaine's description of Psyché's wedding feast,<sup>17</sup> and Mme de Bouillon's departure from Paris after her implication in the famous case of the poisoner La Voisin suggested Psyché's journey with her sorrowing parents to the mysterious meeting with Cupid.<sup>18</sup> Her old servant Hébert, enticed by Gourville to leave her employ for the Condé household, would gladly return, she is sure, to his former state, like the disillusioned shepherd of *Le Berger et le Roi*.<sup>19</sup> A visit to sick friends brought forth the comment in the words of *Les Animaux malades de la Peste*: "Ils ne mouroient pas tous, mais tous étaient frappés."<sup>20</sup> She made fun of her friend Mme de Coulanges, who was too trusting in love affairs, by applying to her a parody of the last six lines of *La Lionne et l'Ourse*.<sup>21</sup>

People she met at the court or in the town are presented in such a way that we see them act before us. It was on the fable that she relied to enliven her pictures and save the scene from the banality of description, projecting it by an association of ideas into the field of our vision. The effect of this method can be seen in her presentation of the Princesse de Monaco and Mlle de Louvigny whom she met one day at the home of Mme de Lafayette, bedecked in mourning garb which made her characterize them in a line from La Fontaine's *Jeune Veuve*: "Le deuil enfin sert de parure."<sup>22</sup> In the same way she used two lines from *l'Aigle et le Hibou* to sketch the young daughters of the Marquis de Lavardin whom she met upon one of her trips to Les Rochers.<sup>23</sup> She referred to her landlord in the language of *Le Pêcheur et le petit Poisson* as that "*carpillon frétin M. d'Agaurry*."<sup>24</sup>

Not only did she make use of La Fontaine's wit but the moral lessons of his fables also appealed to her. "Lisez les fables des Animaux," she wrote to her daughter after the fall from power

<sup>16</sup> VI, 242, Feb. 2, 1680.

<sup>17</sup> X, 141, Apr. 19, 1694.

<sup>18</sup> VI, 266-7, Feb. 16, 1680.

<sup>19</sup> VI, 34, Oct. 4, 1679.

<sup>20</sup> VI, 85, Nov. 10, 1679.

<sup>21</sup> IX, 527, June 25, 1690.

<sup>22</sup> III, 355, Jan. 8, 1674.

<sup>23</sup> II, 224, May 23, 1671.

<sup>24</sup> VI, 51, Oct. 18, 1679.

of her friend Pomponne. "Sa peccadille fut trouvée un cas pendable."<sup>25</sup> By substituting "trouvée" for the original "jugée" she emphasized the truth of Pomponne's sad plight, his loss of royal favor and his disgrace, and she probably had in mind the closing lines of the fable:

Selon que vous serez puissant ou misérable  
Les jugements de cour vous rendront blanc ou noir.

Mme de Sévigné used La Fontaine's work, then, to express her moods of the moment, to convey advice and admonition, to portray vividly an amusing situation in which the peculiarities of her acquaintances are often sketched, and finally to point a moral lesson. She used the fables either directly by copying the words into her letters from some text before her or by adapting them with a change of word or phrase to give a more lively description. She would often weave them into her narrative where they suggest to us a picture and add a humorous touch, for she found in the poet's work much that helped her to greater self expression and added to the sprightliness of her style.

T. W. BUSSOM.

Wesleyan University.

#### ALFRED ZIMMERMANN AS A SOURCE OF HAUPTMANN'S *WEBER*

In his book on Gerhart Hauptmann, Adolf Bartels<sup>1</sup> states that the author of *Die Weber*<sup>2</sup> made use of a treatise by the economist Alfred Zimmermann entitled *Blüte und Verfall des Leinengewebes in Schlesien*.<sup>3</sup> This treatise is a careful historical study of the Silesian weaving industry in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. That Hauptmann included numerous actual

<sup>25</sup> VI, 103, Nov. 29, 1679.

<sup>1</sup> Adolf Bartels, *Gerhart Hauptmann*, Berlin, Emil Felber, 1906, 2 e., p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> References are to pages in *Gerhart Hauptmanns Gesammelte Werke*, I, ed. S. Fischer, Berlin, 1912.

<sup>3</sup> Published by Schulzesche Hof-Buchhandlung, Oldenburg und Leipzig, 1885.

occurrences and details in his presentation of conditions among the weavers is evinced by a comparison of his drama with Zimmermann's investigation.

During the entire three centuries covered by Zimmermann's study the life of the weaver represented an almost unbroken line of misery and suffering. He rarely had enough to eat; usually he lacked proper clothing and shelter as well. Among the recurring causes which served to throttle the weaver Zimmermann includes protective tariffs levied against imports from Silesia, changing political conditions that affected the international market, devastation wrought by wars, crop failures, general economic depression, extortion practiced by buyers, middlemen's profits, the high cost of yarn, and the inefficiency and incompetence of government officials.

This general condition was aggravated by the inertia and total lack of progressiveness of the weavers. Zimmermann states (p. xv) that in the forties of the nineteenth century the rural weavers of Silesia were still commonly using the same loom that had seen service in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. One important reason for the low wage of the weavers was the fact that the technique of the trade was so simple that it could be mastered in a short time and with but little effort (p. xv). As a consequence weaving was an incidental occupation of the peasant and of his entire family during the winter months. Being a secondary employment which almost anybody could follow at home, it was poorly paid. When the peasant was forced to sell his lands because of indebtedness, as frequently happened, the only course open to him was to devote himself solely to weaving, in spite of the low wage scale determined by the prevailing incidental pursuit of this trade. Zimmermann sketches a pitiful picture (p. 60) of the resulting economic enslavement which ended only when death released the wretched starveling.

The economist quotes at some length from a report made in 1844 by a society for the relief of the Silesian weavers. This report furnished a considerable number of details on the misery of the weavers which Hauptmann embodied in his drama. In part the findings as cited by Zimmermann are as follows (p. 349):

In most villages the people were subject to every kind of misery. There were no more shopkeepers, for nobody had money to buy; no children

were at play in the streets, since they were compelled to devote their feeble energies to helping their parents at work. Even the barking of dogs, ordinarily heard in every village, was silent here. No one had food for them, and the faithful guardians had been devoured as a welcome morsel. Not infrequently the houses were half in ruins; often they lacked even a chimney, and the smoke sought an exit through an airhole. For seven years and more, many of the poor had been unable to buy a single article of clothing; some children went entirely naked. Since people were ashamed to go to church in rags, they lacked the solace of religion. Due to repeated failures of the potato crop, the daily food consisted of wild potatoes and of the black flour ordinarily fed to the stock. Most families never saw meat, though in a few homes half a pound of meat was served on the three principal holidays. It was a happy occurrence if a peasant gave a family some buttermilk or potato peelings. A sixty-seven year old weaver told with tears of joy that he had had the good fortune of finding two dead horses which had furnished him and his family with food for a time. In their hunger many weavers devoured sour, stinking glue. Zimmerman continues as follows (p. 350): The abuses of large industry had become manifest and were all the worse because no factory legislation imposed any restraint upon capitalists. Women and children were overtaxed at labor for a low wage. Oppression of every kind was the order of the day. . . . The firm of *Zwanziger and Sons* at Peterswaldau was in particularly bad repute because of its cruelty.

A few quotations from *Die Weber* will serve to establish the most obvious parallels to the above statements. The absolute dearth of money is brought out repeatedly in Act I by requests for advances in wages by weavers who are in debt and unable to purchase a bit of food. In the Baumert home (p. 313) the whole family is at work, including two young girls who never leave the weaving bench (p. 319). Old Baumert has had his half-starved dog butchered because the family has nothing to eat (p. 304). The weavers' houses are crumbling shells and sadly in need of repairs. The rain beats into Weaver Heinrich's shanty (p. 308), and the Baumert family lives in a hovel whose broken windows are partly covered with paper and partly stuffed with straw. The door has no lock and the floor is damaged (p. 313). The smoke makes its escape from the stove through the room, causing discomfort to everyone (p. 320). Weaver Hilse's small, low hut has damaged plaster and a tumble-down stairway (p. 365). Lack of clothing is emphasized in the case of Frau Heinrich, who does not have two shirts for her nine starving boys (p. 308). Mother Baumert says her daughters are unable to earn enough money working year in

and year out to buy a few bits of clothing so they might go out among people or to church (p. 319). Her husband sold his Sunday coat two years ago to buy a bit of pork. Since that time he has not gone to communion nor eaten meat until he ate his dog (p. 324). Mother Baumert is going to take some potato peelings to a peasant in exchange for a bit of buttermilk (p. 321). The Hilse family eats black flower whenever that is obtainable, otherwise a dead horse is dug up and devoured (p. 366). Hornig relates that in the anguish of hunger the weavers eat stinking glue (p. 339). The entire first act presents a pitiful picture of the cruel extortion practiced at Peterswaldau by the rapacious firm of Dreissiger, this being Hauptmann's name for the manufacturer Zwanziger mentioned by Zimmermann as the worst offender in that village.

The passive, mute suffering of the weavers as depicted by Hauptmann in Act I is one of their outstanding characteristics. This is in direct accord with Zimmermann's description of the weavers' broken spirit. For he states (p. 211) that as early as 1793 the suffering was so great as to crush the majority of the weavers completely; they no longer complained, but dumbly accepted any and every treatment accorded them. Similarly Zimmermann states (p. 350) that people conversant with the situation in 1844 maintained that the reason why hunger and misery did not drive the weavers to crime was that the eternal misery had robbed them of the necessary initiative. Raggeddler Hornig's scornful remarks in the drama (p. 339 f.) about the superficiality of government investigations of conditions among the weavers are paralleled by an official report to the Secretary of the Interior in 1844 as summed up by Zimmermann (p. 343 f.). The investigator expresses his surprise at accounts in the newspapers about the distress of the weavers, and minimizes the seriousness of the situation.

It is of interest to note Zimmermann's remarks on the significance of the weavers' song, *Das Blutgericht*. At a time when the injustice of the manufacturers and the constantly rising cost of living had produced great ill-feeling, this song suddenly appeared. It voiced the smoldering, growing sense of injustice so profoundly that it was on everyone's tongue in a trice (p. 350 f.). Zimmermann prints the entire song of 24 stanzas,—each of which has four verses,—together with a quotation from the *Vossische Zeitung*

characterizing it. Hauptmann quotes but seven of these 24 stanzas. In the third stanza (p. 328) the dramatist substitutes the name Dreissiger for Zwanziger and the word Diener for the name Dierig; in addition there are a few minor changes in punctuation. The choice of stanzas is an effective one, and includes those which carry the strongest indictment of the vicious exploitation of labor. It is, of course, quite possible that Hauptmann became acquainted with this song through other sources as well.

Hauptmann follows Zimmermann's account of the inception of the mob in many particulars. The latter narrates (p. 352 f.) that

On June 3, 1844, a group of laborers marched past Zwanziger's establishment singing the weavers' song. The enraged manufacturer commanded one of the men to be seized, and turned him over to the police. In vain the others threatened, and demanded the liberation of the prisoner. Yet everything remained quiet until the following afternoon when a crowd of people quietly came to the factory at three o'clock, threw stones through the windows and entered the buildings. Zwanziger and his people fled. The invaders immediately began to dash to pieces and to destroy everything they found. Goods were hacked into bits or thrown into the stream that flowed through the establishment. More and more people came to participate in the destruction. Whereas vengeance had at first been the motive force, their cupidity was subsequently aroused by the luxurious furnishings, by various valuables and by money found in the house. Everyone dragged away whatever he could lay his hands on, though some did so merely to save things for the proprietor. . . . The rioters left the factory about six o'clock, but at eight they reappeared singing *Bloody Justice* and flying a flag. When the sheriff (Landrat Prittwitz) arrived, they were again in the midst of their destruction. Without cries or noise of any kind, in deep silence they wreaked their vengeance. Only the crashing of breaking furniture and machinery could be heard. The village street was filled with curious people. The perplexed official stepped into a house where an unknown man greeted him with the words: "Herr Landrat, I shall protect you."

In fact, he conducted the official through every room. Old and young, men and women were engaged in demolishing. The sheriff tried to dissuade them; they answered him courteously, but calmly continued their destruction. From Peterswaldau the mob proceeded to Langenbielau (p. 354) to raze the factory of Dierig, whom Hauptmann calls Dittrich. Prittwitz called upon the weavers to disperse (p. 355 f.), but was told they could not do so

until the proprietor of the factory promised them higher wages. Thereupon Dierig hung out a slate with the words: "Ihr sollt alle befriedigt werden." Money was distributed but the crowd grew unruly, and began to attack the soldiers with clubs and stones when threatened by the major in command of troops. Thereupon the soldiers fired into the mob, killing and wounding a number of assailants. In the end the soldiers were forced to retreat. Zimmermann quotes from another much longer description of the mob violence as published in the *Vossische Zeitung* by an eye witness. Suffice it to cite from this account of destruction two particulars which Hauptmann adopted. One is the raid on cellars where the weavers found bottles of liquor (p. 358 f.); in their frenzied thirst they knocked off the necks of the bottles, cut and smeared themselves with blood. The other detail is a comment upon the rage of the weavers, which seemed to vent itself particularly in utterly destroying the banisters (p. 359).

Almost all of the above features have been included in Hauptmann's drama. His group of weavers appeared before Dreissiger's house singing the song (p. 351). Jäger, one of the group, was captured at the command of Dreissiger and was turned over to the police director (p. 353). The crowd demanded Jäger's release, freed him by an act of violence, broke the windows and stormed the house. Dreissiger and his family had barely enough time to escape (pp. 361-363). For obvious dramatic reasons Hauptmann eliminated two intervals in the mob's demonstration against Dreissiger as narrated by Zimmermann. In the drama (p. 367 f.) Hornig relates that the weavers hacked everything from cellar to rafters into bits, and hurled such quantities of fustian into the brook as to dam the water. His tale of the destruction contains a reference even to the breaking up of the banisters. It was Hornig who told of conducting the official through the house (p. 368) and of the deferential, humble manner in which the weavers answered him though they did not heed his admonition to cease destroying. The peddler likewise mentions the silence that prevailed while the poor starvelings took their revenge. Zimmermann's statement (p. 189) about a man who had told the weavers they might eat grass is paralleled by Hornig's words alleging that Dreissiger had told the weavers they might eat grass if they were starving (p. 369). Hauptmann (p. 372) follows Zimmermann in

the distribution of money at the factory of Dittrich (Dierig) and in hanging out a slate with the words: "Ihr sollt alle befriedigt werden" (p. 377). The outcome of the battle with the soldiers is the same in the drama as in Zimmermann's treatise. The drama draws to a close with the retreat of the soldiers before the savage onslaughts of the enraged weavers who are armed with clubs and stones. Here, too (p. 381), a major had vainly called upon the mob to disperse.

Zimmermann states (p. 362) that the courage of the weavers died away just as suddenly as it had flared up, and that they submitted to their old misery as they had done before. The identity of the author of the song was never ascertained.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL.

*Ohio Wesleyan University.*

---

## DRAYTON AND SHAKESPEARE

It is perhaps superfluous to point out any additional indications of the immediate popularity and influence of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. Nevertheless, the appearance for the first time of a full description of *Oenone and Paris*,<sup>1</sup> a poem by T. H. published in 1594 (which seems to be the earliest slavish imitation of *Venus and Adonis*) makes it not amiss to call attention to several passages in Drayton's *Peirs Gaveston* which were suggested by Shakespeare's poem and which I believe are earlier than any allusions hitherto recorded.

*Venus and Adonis* was entered in the Stationers' Registers on April 18, 1593, and, if we are to trust the note from an old manuscript diary transmitted to Malone by an acquaintance of Stevens, was on sale by June 12 of that year. During the summer and fall of 1593, Drayton was at work on the first of his tragical legends, *Peirs Gaveston*, entered in the Stationers' Registers on December 3, 1593, and evidently published soon after, for its "kind and favorable acceptance" is referred to in the preface to *Matilda*,

<sup>1</sup> *Catalogue of Books from the Britwell Court Library, Sotheby and Co., March 24, 1925.*



1594. His recent reading of *Venus and Adonis* furnished him with three of the figures of speech with which he so lavishly decorated his poem.

As Drayton attempts to describe the love of the young Prince Edward for Peirs Gaveston, he compares it first to the wanton ivy twining round the oak and then to the love of Venus for Adonis (Sig. C2 *recto*, ll. 241-6):<sup>2</sup>

Or as Loue-nursing *Venus* when she sportes,  
With cherry-lipt *Adonis* in the shade,  
Figuring her passions in a thousand sortes,  
With sighes, and teares, or what else might perswade,  
Her deere, her sweete, her icy, her life, her loue,  
Kissing his browe, his cheeke, his hand, his gloue.

This is a reminiscence of the opening entreaties of Venus to Adonis (ll. 49-59):

He burnes with bashfull shame, she with her teares  
Doth quench the maiden burning of his cheekes,  
Then with her windie sighes, and golden heares,  
To fan, and blow them drie againe she seekes.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
Euen so she kist his brow, his cheeke, his chin,  
And where she ends, she doth anew begin.

When Drayton describes the execution of Gaveston, a comparison with the dead Adonis comes to his mind (Sig. K1 *verso*, ll. 1567-70):

Like as *Adonis* wounded with the Bore,  
From whose fresh hurt the life-warme blood doth spin,  
Now lyeth wallowing in his purple gore,  
Stayning his faire and Alablaster skin.

The passage in *Venus and Adonis* marks the same contrast between the white skin and the purple blood (ll. 1053-6):

the wide wound, that the boare had trencht  
In his soft flanke, whose wonted lillie white  
With purple tears that his wound wept, had drencht.

In describing the beauty of Gaveston as he lay dead, Drayton

<sup>2</sup> My quotations are taken from a photostat of the copy of *Peirs Gaveston* in the Huntington Library.

thinks of the turning of Adonis to a flower (Sig. K3 *recto*, ll. 1645-6):

With palenes touching that fayre rubied lip,  
Now waxing purple, like *Adonis* flower.

Shakespeare has thus described the metamorphosis of Adonis (ll. 1165-70):

By this the boy that by her side laie kild,  
Was melted like a vapour from her sight,  
And in his blood that on the ground laie spild,  
A purple floure sproong vp, checkred with white,  
Resembling well his pale cheekes, and the blood,  
Which in round drops, vpon their whitenesse stood.

Further, it seems probable that Drayton had also had the pleasure of reading Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in manuscript, for to him the reunion of Gaveston, after his exile, with King Edward is like the meeting of Hero and Leander (Sig. I2 *verso*, ll. 1417-22):

Or as Muse-meruaile *Hero*, when she clips,  
Her deer *Leanders* byllow-beaten limms,  
And with sweet kisses seazeth on his lips,  
When for her sake deep Hellespont he swimms,  
Might by our tender-deer imbracings proue,  
Fayre *Heros* kindnes, and *Leanders* loue.

The details of this reference do not fit exactly Marlowe's version of the story; Drayton has changed them a little to meet his need. But I suspect that "Muse-meruaile *Hero*" is said with reference to Marlowe whom Drayton admired greatly, as the well-known compliment in his *Of Poets and Poesie* testifies.

These figures of speech in *Peirs Gaveston* mark only the beginning of the influence of *Venus and Adonis* and of *Hero and Leander* upon Drayton. He saw the opportunity which the mythological poem offered, and in the spring of 1595 wrote his *Endimion and Phoebe* in which he is indebted to the poems of Shakespeare and Marlowe both for general suggestion and for specific detail.<sup>3</sup>

J. WILLIAM HEBEL.

*Cornell University.*

---

<sup>3</sup> See Drayton's *Endimion and Phoebe*, ed. by J. W. Hebel, The Shakespeare Head Press, Houghton Mifflin, 1925.

CONCERNING *TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA* AND  
MONTEMAYOR'S *DIANA*

In his article "The Two Gentlemen of Verona and Italian Comedy" (*Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne*, University of Michigan, 1925), Professor Oscar J. Campbell argues that Shakespeare's contributions to the growth of romantic comedy are to be found, "not in new forms of dramatic ingenuity, but in the emotional deepening of elements taken bodily from a drama which was at once comedy of intrigue and high complicated farce." In establishing this thesis as it relates to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the writer accepts two views which are decidedly questionable: first, in regard to Shakespeare's possible use of the lost play *Felix and Philomena*, and second, in regard to his use of the *Diana* of Montemayor.

The lost play *Felix and Philomena* was presented before Queen Elizabeth at Greenwich, shortly after New Year's, 1585. Professor Campbell concludes that of all the versions of the *Diana* this was "most apt to come within the range of Shakespeare's notice." In the first place, it would seem contrary to the playwright's methods to base a play of his own upon an adaptation of a work which was extant in the original and in translations, both French and English. Moreover, a study of *The Two Gentlemen*, as well as of *Twelfth Night*, indicates that he was acquainted with other versions of the original story found in the Italian play *Gl' Ingannati*, drawing from Riche's *Apollonius and Silla*, *Bandello* (Pt. II, Nov. 36), and even from *Gl' Ingannati* itself. Hence the improbability that Shakespeare depended upon the text of the lost play. Another fact towards this conclusion: as the notice of the lost play indicates, the manuscript belonged to the Queen's Men. As their property it could scarcely have come into the hands of Shakespeare, one of the King's Men. Besides, his play probably belongs to 1593-1594, when the Queen's Men were in the provinces; they came again to London in 1594. If Shakespeare knew of the play, the dramatic possibilities of Montemayor's story may immediately have been suggested to his mind. He may then have sought out a copy of the *Diana* in one form or another, as well as some other versions of the story.

Besides the Spanish *Diana*, the story of Felismena was extant in no fewer than five other forms. That Shakespeare may have read the *Diana* in the original Spanish, though improbable, is by no means impossible. In view of the romance's enormous popularity on the continent, it seems reasonable that it was brought to England soon after its publication (1559-1560), and there widely enjoyed. Yet discounting this possibility, there are two English translations which have been overlooked by Professor Campbell: first, that by Edward Paston, a version most highly commended by Bartholomew Yong; and second, the fragment of Montemayor's tale of Felismena put into eclogue form by Barnabe Googe (1563).

Finally in regard to parallels between *The Two Gentlemen* and the story of Felismena, Professor Campbell states:

Only the circumstances attendant upon the dropping of the love-letter and the conditions under which the disguised page overhears the serenade remain as evidence of a direct relationship between the plot of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and the story from the *Diana Enamorada*.

Of course Montemayor's story of Felix and Felismena, like Shakespeare's story of Proteus and Julia contains the structural commonplaces of Italian comedy. Yet a close examination of the two tales makes it obvious that, though Shakespeare used his chief model with considerable freedom, frequently turning to other versions, he depended most upon the prose story of Montemayor, probably because of the dramatic advance of the Spaniard over his predecessors and followers in handling a well-known story. Aside from the two coincidents mentioned above, there are parallels between play and romance, especially those involving the double-edged addresses of the girl-page to her master, to his mistress, and to herself, which afford indisputable proof of the main source of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*: not "some thoroughly Italianate play," but the Spanish romance.

Studies of Shakespeare's debt to Montemayor in this play, in *Twelfth Night*, and in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* I hope soon to publish.

T. P. HARRISON, JR.

University of Texas.

## A WOMAN CONCEALS WHAT SHE KNOWS NOT

In *MLN*, XL, 380, Professor Wilder compares *I Henry IV*: II, III, 112: "for I well believe Thou wilt not utter what thou dost not know" with Seneca, *Cont.* II, v, 12: "Mulier . . . quae id solum potest tacere, quod nescit" and suspects that Shakespeare knew this passage in the original Latin. Professor G. L. Kittredge (*MLN*, XL, 440) points out that this proverb is found in Nashe's *Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589). This had long since been noted by Malone (*Shak. ed.*, 1821, vol. xvi, 258). Further evidence for the early currency of the proverb in Great Britain is to be seen in the Scottish Proverbs of David Fergus(s)on who died at an advanced age in 1598. His collection, however, was not published until 1641. We now have a reprint of it edited by E. Beveridge for the Scottish Text Society (1924): cf. page 108, no. 882: "Women and bairns keeps counsel of that they know not." After Shakespeare's day it is again reported as a proverb by George Herbert (1593-1633) whose collection was not published until 1640 (*ed.* Grosart, III, 366, no. 1024). It is not in Heywood, Camden or Draxe, the three collections before or contemporary with Shakespeare. Professor Wilder remarks that editors have referred to Ray (*ed.* 1670, p. 50; Bohn 61). In later collections we find a shorter and perhaps more popular form, "Women conceal all that they know not" (Fuller, *Gnomologia*, 1732, p. 256). Seneca may be the literary source for a proverb which seems to be international. Wander (*Deutsches Sprichwörterlexikon*, v, 51, no. 1134; p. 29, no. 641) compares the German forms with the French, Italian, Bohemian, etc.: "Une femme ne cèle que ce qu'elle ne sçait pas" (Le Roux de Lincy, 1859, I, 231; "La donna col tacer sà quel, che non sà" (Pazzaglia, 1702, p. 368, 13): "Žena smlčí každé tajemství, o němž neví" (A woman keeps every secret she knows not) Čelakovsky, 394. According to Le Roux de Lincy (Vol. I, xli) the French form of the proverb is to be found in the rare collection of Jean Lebon, *Adages et Proverbes* (ca. 1578). O. von Reinsberg-Düringsfeld (*Die Frau im Sprichwort*, p. 15) quotes in German the Serbian proverb, "Die Frau verschweigt nur das Geheimnis, welches sie nicht weiss." In later Scottish collections Fergusson's version gives way to dialect forms of the proverb:

"Women and Bairns lain what they know not" (Kelly, 1721, p. 347); "Women and Bairns lein what they ken not" (Ramsey, 1737, p. 75; cf. also Cheviot, 402). The Gaelic form is: "An ni nach fios do na mnathan ceilidh iad" (What the women don't know they'll conceal), Nicholson, 33. If we may regard Seneca as the literary source of this international proverb, we have here but one more example of the enormous influence of literature in creating proverbs. Unfortunately we have no adequate work showing the contribution of antiquity and the middle ages to English proverb lore.

*Washington University.*

RICHARD JENTE.

## ITALIAN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY CRITICISM

Some time ago Professor R. C. Williams called attention to the need for a bibliography of Cinquecento criticism, publishing at the same time a valuable list of *Italian Critical Treatises of the Sixteenth Century*.<sup>1</sup> The usefulness of his list may perhaps be enhanced by the following supplement of comments and additions.

### I. COMMENTS

1522. As Professor J. G. Gillet has already pointed out,<sup>2</sup> "Campiano" (F. Nausea *Blancicampianus*) was not an Italian, and his treatise, though printed in Italy, does not strictly belong in the list.
1552. Grifoli's *In Artem poeticam Horatii Interpretatio* was first printed Florentiae, 1550. This 1552 (Paris) edition is professedly a reproduction of the Florentine.
1553. Varchi's *Lezione della Poetica in generale* and five *Lezioni della Poesia*, delivered partly in 1553, partly in 1554, were not printed until several years later (1560-1561?; 1590). They are, of course, accessible in various more recent editions.
1555. G. Fabricius, the editor of the *Opera Q. Horatii Flacci*, Basileae, 1555, was the German Georg Fabricius of Chemnitz.<sup>3</sup> This item should, therefore, be omitted from the list, neither editor nor printer being Italian.
1564. Minturno's *L'Arte Poetica* was printed a year earlier: In Venetia, 1563.

<sup>1</sup> *M. L. N.*, xxxv, 506-507.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, xl, 125.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. D. Schreber, *De Vita G. Fabricii Chemnicensis*, Lipsiae, 1717.

1565. G. Fabricius, *De re poetica* should be omitted (Cf. under 1555).  
 1592. The *Discorso* of Castravilla listed under this date was, according to its modern editor, Mario Rossi,<sup>4</sup> written and circulated soon after 1570, but not printed until the seventeenth century with the *Annotazioni . . . di Bellisario Bulgarini*, Siena, 1608. To Rossi's evidence for earlier circulation we may add the fact that it was cited in 1583 in Carriero's *Apologia*.

## II. ADDITIONS

The list below is intended to include only works of some significance from the standpoint of literary criticism. Treatises on the linguistic and grammatical problems of the century are in general not mentioned unless they contain incidental discussion of literary matters (such as style, etc.). The works of Acarisio, Rinaldo Corso, Fortunio, Gabriele, Liburnio, Tolomei, Trissino, *et al.*, on language and grammar are, therefore, not included. Bembo's *Prose* and Dolce's *Osservazioni*, however, are judged worthy of mention (one book in each of them being essentially a *Poetica*); and also, on somewhat more slender grounds, Varchi's *Ercolano*.

Works purely on letter-writing<sup>5</sup> are also not listed here unless, like Guarini's *Segretario*, they contain a more general discussion of matters rhetorical.

Phrase books and concordances<sup>6</sup> are similarly omitted, except when, as Dolce's *Modi Affigurati*, they contain matter of definitely critical purpose.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *I Discorsi di Ridolfo Castravilla contro Dante e di Filippo Sassetti in difesa di Dante* a cura di Mario Rossi, Città di Castello, 1897, pp. 9-10.

<sup>5</sup> Such as Franciscus Niger, *De modo Epistolandi*, Venetiis, 1502; G.-B. Palatino, *Libro nel quale s'insegna a scrivere ogni sorte di lettera*, Roma, 1561; Francesco Sansovino, *Del Segretario*, Vinegia, 1568, 1578, 1588; Torquato Tasso, *Il Segretario*, Ferrara, 1587, 1588, 1592; Angelo Ingegneri, *Il buon Segretario*, Roma, 1594, and Venezia, 1595; G. C. Capaccio, *Il Segretario*, Venezia, 1599; and the like.

<sup>6</sup> E. g., Francesco Alunno, *Le Osservazioni sopra il Petrarca*, Vinegia, 1539 and 1550; F. Alunno, *Le Ricchezze della Lingua Volgare sopra il Boccaccio*, Vinegia, 1543, 1551, 1555, 1557, etc.; F. Alunno, *Della Fabbrica del Mondo*, Venetia, 1546, 1556, etc.; Hieronimo Garimberto, *Concetti*, Venetia, 1563, 1585, and 1596; G. Stefano di Montemerlo, *Delle Phrasi Toscane*, Venetia, 1566 and 1594; and so on.

<sup>7</sup> Following these criteria, Mazzone da Miglionico's *Fiori della Poesia*, Venezia, 1592, included in Professor Williams' list, would be omitted from

Again, the numerous Cinquecento editions of the critical and rhetorical works of Aristotle, Cicero, Cornificius, Donatus, Horace, Longinus, Quintilian, etc., are not here included, as they may readily be looked up in various bibliographies under the names of their respective classic authors. The list here given, however, takes note of translations from the Latin or Greek, and also of the more elaborate commentaries.

Finally, no mention is here made of the numerous lectures by the two Della Barba, Gelli, Giambullari, Oradini, Serafino, Varchi, *et al.*, on minor aspects of the *Commedia*, etc., or on single lyric poems, Petrarchan and otherwise.

In order to add to the practical usefulness of the list, an attempt has been made to locate at least one copy of each work, and to indicate where it is to be found. In this connection, the letters BM indicate that a work is to be found in the library of the British Museum; BNF stands for the Florence Biblioteca Nazionale; CU stands for the library of Columbia University; FP, the Fiske Petrarch Collection at Cornell University; NY, the New York Public Library; WLB, the present writer's own Cinquecento collection. Of six works to which references have been found it has not been possible to verify the actual existence.

- 1502. Bonfini, Matteo, *Tractatus de arte metrica utilissimus*, Fani. BM.
- 1509. Da Tempo, Antonio, *De ritimis vulgaribus*,<sup>8</sup> Venetiis. BM.
- 1513. Lyburnio, Nicolao, *Le Selvette* (esp. *Prima Selvetta*), Vinegia. WLB.
- 1518. Pico della Mirandola, Gio. Francesco, *Physici libri duo . . . et rhetorici duo . . .*, Basileae. (Reprinted in part: *Io. F. Proi . . . ad P. Bembum de imitatione libellus*, Venetiis, 1530. BM.)
- 1525. Bembo, Pietro, *Prose della Volgar Lingua*,<sup>9</sup> Venezia. BM. (Also many later editions.)
- 1525. Equicola, Mario, *Libro de Natura de Amore*, Venetia. WLB. (Cf. C. Trabalza, *La Critica Letteraria*, Milano, 1915, pp. 65-67.)
- 1529. Trissino, Gio. Giorgio, *Dante, de la volgare eloquenzia tradotto in lingua italiana*, [?Vicenza.] BM.
- 1540. Calcagnini, Celio, *Ad Cynthii J. B. Gyraldi . . . super Imitatione commentatio*, Basileae. BM. (With *Cynthia G. B. Gyraldi poemata*.)

---

the present one; as it is essentially no more than an elaborate collection of phrases and figures from the Latin poets, with Italian equivalents.

<sup>8</sup> Composed early in the fourteenth century, but first printed at this date, and constantly cited by the Cinquecento lyric theorists.

<sup>9</sup> The second book is essentially a *Poetica*.



1541. Gaucicus, P., *Super Arte Poetica Horatii. Ejusdem Legis Poeticae epilogus*, Romae. BM.
1541. Ricci, Bartolomeo, *De Imitatione libri tres*, Venetiis. (Also Venetiis, 1545. BM.)
1542. Bruciolli, A., *Rhetorica di M. Tullio Cicerone* [or rather of Q. Cornificius] *tradotta in lingua Toscana*, Venetia. BM, WLB.
1542. Speroni, Sperone, *Dialogo della Rhetorica*, Vinegia. WLB. (In *I dialogi di Messer Speron Sperone*. Subsequently often reprinted.)
1543. Giraldis Cinthio, Gio. Battista, *Al . . . S. D. Hercole II da Este*. (Letter on Tragedy, and especially his *Didone*, first printed, over date of 1543, with the *Didone Tragedia*, Venetia, 1583, pp. 129-157. WLB.)
1543. Sansovino, Francesco, *La Rhetorica*. [Bologna.] NY.
1544. Barbaro, Daniello, *In tres libros rhetoricorum Aristotelis Commentaria*, Lugduni. WLB.
1544. [Camillo Delminio, Giulio,] *Due trattati; l'uno delle materie che possono venir sotto lo stile dell' eloquente; l' altro della imitatione*, Venezia. BM. (Several later editions, in CU, FP, NY, WLB.)
1545. Cataneo, R., *Dialogo di Marco Tullio Cicerone d' intorno alle partitioni oratorie con la spositione . . .*, Venezia. BM.
1545. Giraldis, Lilio Gregorio, *De poetica et poetarum historia dialogus I* (in *Historiae poetarum . . . dialogi decem*), Basileae. WLB.
1545. Memo, Giovammaria, *L'Oratore*, Vinetia. WLB.
1545. Del Rosso, Paolo, *Regole osservanze et avvertenze sopra lo scrivere . . . in prosa & in versi*, Napoli. BM.
1546. Pedemonte, Francesco, *Ecphrasis in Horatii Flacci Artem Poeticam*, Venetiis. BM.
1546. Sansovino, Francesco, *L'Arte Oratoria . . . in tre libri, ne' quali si ragiona tutto quello che all' artificio appartiene, così del poeta come dell' oratore*, Venezia. (Venetia, 1569. BM; Venetia, 1575. WLB.)
1547. Dolce, Lodovico, *Il Dialogo dell' Oratore di Cicerone tradotto*, Vinegia. BM, WLB.
1548. *Tradottione antica della Rettorica d' Aristotile nuovamente trovata*, Padova. BM.
1548. Robortelli, F., *Paraphrasis in librum Horatii de Arte poetica*, Florentiae. BM.
1550. [Cavalcanti, Bartolomeo,] *Giuditio sopra la tragedia di Canace e Macareo, con molte utili considerazioni circa l' Arte Tragica . . .*, [Lucca.] BM. (Venetia, 1566, WLB. The work is dated *in fine* 1543.)
1550. Dolce, Lodovico, *Le Osservationi della lingua volgare (Quarto libro nel quale si tratta della volgar poesia)*, Venezia. (Vinegia, 1554, WLB; 1556, BM.)

1550. [Landi, Ortensio,] *La Sferza de' scrittori antichi et moderni di M. Anonimo di Utopia . . .*, Vinegia. WLB.
- 1550?. Mutoni, Niccolò, *Poetica di Marco Girolamo Vida in versi toscani sciolti trapportata*, [?Venezia.] BM.
1552. Camillo Delminio, Giulio, *Discorso in materia del suo Theatro*, Venezia. FP. (Later editions, CU, NY, WLB.)
1553. Patrizio, Francesco, *La Città Felice . . . Discorso della diversità de' Furori Poetici . . .*, Venetia. BM.
- [1554.] Giraldis Cintio, Giovambattista, *Lettera ovvero discorso sopra il comporre le satire atte alle scene*. (Dated 1554, but apparently not printed until 1864 in *Scritti estetici di G. G. Cintio*, Milano, Daelli, II, 124-150.)
1554. Ruscelli, Girolamo, *Tre Discorsi a M. Lodovico Dolce*, Venetia. WLB.
1556. De la Barba, Simon and Pompeo, *La Topica di Cicerone col Comento*, Vinegia. WLB.
1557. Barbaro, Daniello, *Della Eloquenza* (edited by Ruscelli), Venetia, WLB.
- [1557.] Giraldis Cintio, G.-B., *Lettera* [to Bernardo Tasso on epic and heroic poetry: thirty-two pages]. (Printed, with date of Ferrara, Oct. 10, 1557, in *Lettere di XIII Huomini illustri . . . da Tomaso Porcacchi*, Venetia, 1582, *Libro XVII* [first printed in that year], 405 v. ff. WLB.)
1558. [Caro, Annibale,] *Apologia degli Academici di Banchi di Roma contra a messer Lodovico Castelvetro*, Parma. WLB.
1559. Atanagi, Dionigi, *Ragionamento della eccellentia et perfettion de la historia*, Venetia. BM.
- [1559-1560.] [Castelvetro, Lodovico,] *Ragione d' alcune cose segnate nella canzone d' Annibal Caro . . .*, Keskika, [Modena.] WLB.
1560. Ammirato, Scipione, *Il Dedalione, Dialogo del Poeta*, Napoli.
1560. Camillo Delminio, Giulio, *Discorso sopra l' Idee di Hermogene* (in the second vol. of the *Opere*), Vinegia. WLB. (Later edits., FP, NY, BM.)
1560. Camillo Delminio, G., *La Topica, o vero della elocutione, ib., id.*
1560. Mascher, Girolamo, *Il Fiore della Rettorica*, Vinegia. BM, WLB.
1560. Patrizi, Francesco, *Della Historia*, Venetia. BM, WLB.
1561. Pigna, Gio. Battista, *Gli Heroici*, Vinegia. BM.
1561. Pigna, G. B., *Poetica Horatiana*. Venetis. BM.
1561. Toscanella, Orazio, *Retorica di M. Tullio Cicerone a G. Herennio ridotta in alberti*, Vinegia. BM. (Also, apparently with additions, Vinegia, 1566. WLB.)
1562. Toscanella, O., *Precetti necessarij et altre cose utilissime . . . sopra diverse cose pertinenti alla . . . Poetica, Retorica . . . et ad altre facoltà*, Venetia. BM, WLB. (Also Venetia, 1566 and 1567. BNF.)
1564. Dolce, L., *Modi affigurati . . . della volgar lingua, con un discorso*

- sopra a mutamenti e diversi ornamenti dell' Ariosto, Venetia. WLB.
1565. Piccolomini, A., *Copiosissima parafrase nel primo libro della Retorica d' Aristotile*, Venetia. BM.
1566. Fabrini, Giovanni, *L' Opere d' Oratio . . . comentate in lingua vulgare Toscana*, Venetia. BM.
1566. Giraldis, Lucio Olimpico, *Ragionamento in difesa di Terentio*, Monte Regale. WLB.
1566. Grasso, Benedetto, *Oratione contra gli Terentiani*, Monte Regale. WLB.
1566. Toscanella, O., *Osservazioni sopra l' opere di Virgilio per discoprire ed insegnare a porre in pratica gli artificij importantissimi dell' Arte Poetica*, Vinegia. BM.
1567. Toscanella, Orazio, *L' Institutioni oratorie di Marco Fabio Quintiliano . . . tradotte . . . et arricchite*, Venezia. (Also Venetia, 1586. BM.)
1567. Toscanella, O., *Quadrivio, il quale contiene un trattato della strada che si ha da tenere in scrivere istoria*, Venetia. BM.
1567. Toscanella, O., *Rodolfo Agricola Frisio della invention dialettica; tradotta . . . con alcune annotationi*, Venetia. BM.
1568. Riccoboni, Ant., *De Historia Commentarius*, Venetis. BM, WLB.
1568. Toscanella, O., *Libro primo degli artificij osservati . . . sopra Cicerone . . .*, Venezia. BNF. (Also with title *Artificij Oratori e Poetici osservati . . .*, ib., 1594. BNF.)
1568. Toscanella, O., *Il dialogo della partitione oratoria di M. T. Cicerone . . . tirato in tavole*, Vinegia. BM.
1569. Piccolomini, A., *Piena . . . parafrase nel secondo libro della Retorica d' Aristotile*, Venetia. BM.
1570. Caro, Annibale, *La Rettorica di Aristotile tradotta*, Venezia. (Eighteenth century edition in BM, FP, etc.)
1570. Varchi, Benedetto, *L' Hercolano*, Vinetia. WLB. (Also Fiorenza. BM.)
1571. Piccolomini, A., *I tre libri della Rettorica di Aristotile tradotti in lingua volgare*, Venetia. BM, CU.
1572. Pagano, P., *Dionysii Longini De sublimi dicendi genere latinitate donatus*, Venetis. BM.
1572. De' Conti, Antonio Maria, *M. A. Majoragii in tres Aristotelis libros de Arte Rhetorica, quos ipse Latinos fecit explanationes*, Venetiis. BM.
1572. Piccolomini, A., *Piena . . . parafrase . . . nel terzo libro della Retorica d' Aristotile*, Venetia. BM, WLB.
- 1573-74. *Annotationi et discorsi sopra alcuni luoghi Del Decameron, Di M. Giovanni Boccacci; fatte dalli molto Magnifici Sig. Deputati . . .*, Fiorenza. WLB.
1574. De Nores, Giason, *Breve Trattato dell' Oratore*, Padova. BM.
1576. Foglietta, Uberto, *De ratione scribendae historiae*, Basileae. BM.

1576. Viperani, Giannantonio, *De scribenda historia*, Basileae. BM.
1576. Viperani, G., *De scribendis virorum illustrium vitis*, Basileae. BM.
1578. Denores, G., *Introduzzione ridotta poi in alcune tavole sopra i tre libri della Rhetorica d' Aristotile*, Venetia. BM.
1578. Pino da Cagli, Bernardo, *Discorso intorno al componimento della Comedia de' nostri tempi*, Venetia.<sup>10</sup> (Bibl. Nac. Madrid.)
1580. Caburacci, Francesco, *Trattato . . . con un breve discorso in difesa dell' Orlando Furioso . . .*, Bologna. BM.
1581. Catena, Girolamo, *Discorso . . . sopra la traduttione*, Venetia. WLB.
1581. Ruscelli, G., *De Commentarij della Lingua Italiana*, Venetia. WLB.
1581. Viperani, G., *De componenda oratione*, Antverpiae. BM.
1582. Carriero, Alessandro, *Breve ed ingegnoso Discorso contra l'opera di Dante*, Padoa. BM.
1582. Lombardelli, Orazio, *Giudizio sopra il Goffredo di Torquato Tasso*, Firenze. BNF.
1582. Muzio, Hieronimo, *Battaglie in difesa dell' Italica lingua*, Vinegia. WLB.
1583. Bulgarini, Bellisario, *Alcune considerazioni sopra 'l Discorso di M. Giacopo Mazzoni, fatto in difesa della Commedia di Dante*,<sup>11</sup> Siena. BM. (Also in the University of Pennsylvania Library.)
1583. Carriero, A., *Apologia contra le imputationi del Sig. Bellisario Bulgarini: Palinodia del medesimo Carriero, nella quale si dimostra l' eccellenza del poema di Dante*, Padova. BM.
1583. Zoppio, Girolamo, *Ragionamenti in difesa di Dante e del Petrarca*, Bologna. FP.
1584. Denores, Giason, *Della Rhetorica*, Venetia. BM, WLB.
1584. Salviati, Lionardo, *Degli Avvertimenti della lingua sopra 'l Decamerone Volume Primo . . . Ne' quali si discorre partitamente dell' opere, e del pregio di forse cento Prosatori . . . e si ragiona dello stile . . .*, Venezia. WLB. (Also in the Library of Congress.)
1584. [Salviati, L.,] *Il Lasca, Dialogo d' Ormannozzo Rigogoli . . . nel quale si mostra che non importa che la Storia sia vera, e quistionasi per incidenza alcuna cosa contro la Poesia*, Firenze. BNF.
1584. [Salviati, L.,] *Degli Accademici della Crusca Difesa dell' Orlando Furioso dell' Ariosto Contra 'l Dialogo dell' epica poesia di Cammillo Pellegrino*, Firenze. BM. (Also Ferrara, 1585. WLB.)
1585. Ariosto, Horatio, *Difese dell' Orlando Furioso . . .*, Ferrara. WLB.
1585. Bulgarini, B., *Repliche alle Risposte di O. Capponi sopra le . . .*

<sup>10</sup> For notice of this work I am indebted to Professor J. E. Gillet.

<sup>11</sup> It was to refute this criticism of his earlier work that Mazzoni (through Tuccio dal Corno) wrote his *Difesa di Dante*, Cesena, 1587, listed by Professor Williams.

- sue considerazioni intorno al discorso di M. G. Mazzoni composto in difesa della Comedia di Dante*, Siena. BM.
1585. De' Rossi, Bastiano, *Lettera a Flamminio Mannelli nella quale si ragiona . . . del dialogo dell' Epica poesia di M. Camm. Pellegrino*, . . ., Firenze. BM, WLB.
1585. Patrici, Francesco, *Parere in difesa dell' Ariosto*, Ferrara. WLB.
1585. Pellegrino, Camillo, *Replica alla risposta degli Accademici della Crusca . . .*, Vico Equense. WLB. (Also, with an index, Mantova, 1587. WLB.)
1585. [Salviati, Lionardo,] *Dello Infarinato Accademico della Crusca Risposta all' Apologia di Torquato Tasso intorno all' Orlando Furioso, e alla Gerusalem liberata*, Firenze. WLB.
1585. Tasso, Torquato, *Apologia in difesa della sua Gerusalemme Liberata*, Ferrara, 1585. WLB.
1585. Zoppio, Girolamo, *Risposta alle opposizioni sanesi fatte a' suoi Ragionamenti in difesa di Dante*, Fermo. FP.
1586. Bulgarini, B., *Risposte a' ragionamenti del Sig. Ieronimo Zoppio intorno alla commedia di Dante . . . Replica alla risposta del medesimo Zoppio intitolata: Alle opposizioni Sanesi*, Siena. BM.
1586. Gentili, Scipio, *Annotazioni sopra La Gierusalemme Liberata di Torquato Tasso*, Leida. WLB.
1586. [?Salviati, L.,] *Considerazioni di Carlo Fioretti da Vernio intorno a un discorso di M. Giulio Ottonelli da Fanano sopra ad alcune dispute dietro alla Gierusalem . . .*, Firenze. WLB.
1586. Lombardelli, Orazio, *Discorso intorno ai contrasti, che si fanno sopra la Gierusalemme . . .*, Ferrara. BM, WLB. (Also Mantova, 1586; and Basilea, 1586.)
1586. Ottonelli, Giulio, *Discorso . . . con le difese della Gierusalemme liberata . . .*, Ferrara. WLB. (Also Terrasca, 1586. BM.)
1586. Parigiuolo, Lorenzo, *Questioni della Poesia*, Roma.
1586. Salviati, L. *Avvertimenti della Lingua . . . Volume Secondo*, Firenze.
1586. Sardi, Alessandro, *Discorso della Poesia di Dante, etc.*, Venetia. BM, OU.
1586. Tasso, T., *Risposta al discorso di O. Lombardelli . . .*, Ferrara. BM.
1587. Camillo Delminio, G., *Pro suo de eloquentia theatro ad Gallos oratio*, Venetiis. BM.
1587. Correa, T., *In librum De Arte Poetica explanationes*,<sup>12</sup> Venetiis. BM.
1587. Dal Corno, Tuccio, *Della Difesa della Comedia di Dante*,<sup>13</sup> Cesena. BM, WLB.

<sup>12</sup> Perhaps merely a second edition of the *Explanations de arte poetica*, Roma, 1586, listed by Professor Williams.

<sup>13</sup> The author of this *Difesa* is not named on the title-page. The work is here listed with the name of Tuccio Dal Corno because frequently attributed to him (e. g. in BM.), and because it was in large part composed by him.

1587. De gli Oddi, Nicolò, *Dialogo in difesa di Camillo Pellegrini . . .*, Venetia. BM.
1587. Talentoni, Giovanni, *Lezione . . . del modo di cominciare e narrare e concludere in qual si voglia Poema*, Fiorenza. BM.
1587. Zoppio, Hieronimo, *Particelle poetiche sopra Dante*, Bologna. BM, FP.
1588. Cerutus, F., *Paraphrasis in Quinti Horatii Flacci librum de arte poetica*, Verona. BM.
1588. [Guarini, Batt.,] *Il Verrato, o difesa di quanto ha scritto G. Denores contro le Tragicomédie e le Pastorali . . .*, Ferrara. BM.
1588. Guastavini, Giulio, *Risposta all' Infarinato . . . Intorno alla Gierusalemme . . .*, Bergamo. WLB. (Also Pavia, 1592. BM.).
1588. Riccoboni, A., *Paraphrasis in Rhetoricam Aristotelis*, Francofurti. BM.
1588. [Salviati, L.,] *Lo 'nfarinato secondo . . . Risposta al libro intitolato Replica di Camillo Pellegrino . . . Con Molte . . . giustioni di Poesia . . . e con la Tavola copiosissima*, Firenze. WLB.
1589. Belprato, Vincenzo, *La Veronica, o del Sonetto*, Genova.
1589. Malatesta, Giosepe, *Della nuova poesia . . .*, Verona, WLB. (Also 1590. BM.)
1589. Porta, Malatesta, *Il Rossi overo parere sopra alcune obiettoni fatte dall' Infarinato . . . intorno alla Gierusalemme . . .*, Rimino. BM.
1589. Rossi, Nicolò, *Discorsi intorno alla Comedia*, Vicenza. BM.
1589. Spontone, Ciro, *Il Bottrigaro, overo del nuovo verso enneasillabo*, Verona. BM.
1589. Zoppio, Hieronimo, *La Poetica sopra Dante*, Bologna. BM.
1590. Camillo Delminio, G., *In Rhetoricen usagoge*, Maceratae. BM.
1590. De Nores, Giason, *Apologia contro l'Auttor del Verato . . .*, [Padova.] BM.
1590. Pescetti, Orlando, *Del Primo Infarinato . . . difesa contro alla Sig. G. Guastavini*. [Verona.] BM.
1590. Rossi, Niccolò, *Discorsi intorno alla Tragedia*, Vicenza. BM.
1590. Summo, Faustino, *Discorso intorno al contrasto tra il Signor Speron Speroni, ed il giudizio stampato contra la sua Tragedia di Canace e di Macareo*, Padova. BM.
1590. Zinano, Gabriele, *Discorso della Tragedia*, Reggio.<sup>24</sup> (Copy in the Berlin Library.)
1590. Zinano, G., *Sommarii di varie Rettoriche . . .*, Reggio. BM.
1593. Guarini, B., *Il verrato secondo . . .*, Firenze. BM.

---

It was entirely based, however (as he states in the Dedication), on the ideas, spoken and written, of Jacopo Mazzoni, who may therefore with equal propriety be regarded as its author, and so appears in Professor Williams' list.

<sup>24</sup> For notice of this work I am indebted to Professor J. E. Gillet.

1594. Camillo Delminio, Giulio, *Le Idee ovvero forme della oratione da Hermogene considerate et ridotte in questa lingua*, Udine. BM.
1594. Guarini, B., *Il Segretario*, Venetia. WLB.
1595. Possevin, A., *Tractatio de Poesi et Pictura Ethica, humana et fabulosa*, Lugduni.
1596. Borghesi, Diomede, *Oratione intorno a gli onori et a' pregi della Poesia e della Eloquenza*, Siena. BM.
1596. Malatesta, G., *Della Poesia Romanzesca . . . Ragionamento secondo e terzo*, Roma.
1597. Speroni, S., *Canace Tragedia . . . alla quale sono aggiunte . . . alcune Lettioni in difesa della Tragedia*, Venetia. BM, WLB.
1598. Lombardelli, O., *I Fonti Toscani*, Firenze. BM, BNF.
1599. Feronio, Silvio, *Il Chiariti, trattandosi de' Fonti Toscani di Orazio Lombardelli*, Lucca.
1600. Malacreta, Gio. Pietro, *Considerazioni sopra il Pastor Fido . . .*, Vicenza. BM. (Also Venetia, 1600. BM, WLB.)
1600. Beni, Paolo, *Risposta alle Considerationi . . . del . . . Malacreta . . .*, Padova. WLB.
1600. Beni, P., *Discorso, nel quale si dichiarano e stabiliscono molte cose pertinenti alla Risposta . . .*, Venetia. WLB.

Also composed during the Cinquecento were the following:

- Barbieri, Giammaria, *Dell' Origine della Poesia Rimata*. (First printed at Modena, 1790. BM.)
- Bonciani, Francesco, *Lezione sopra il comporre delle Novelle*. (Printed in *Prose Fiorentine raccolte* . . ., Firenze, 1716-1745, III, i, 74 ff.)
- Sassetti, Filippo, *Discorso sopra Dante*. (Edited by Mario Rossi, Città di Castello, 1897. Cf. n. 4, above.)
- Sassetti, F., *Discorso contro Ariosto*. (Cf. Rossi, *op. cit.*, 13.)
- Sassetti, F., *Esposizione della Poetica*. (Cf. Rossi. *ibid.*)
- Speroni, S., *Dialogo dell' Istoria*. (This with other critical writings of Speroni was not printed until 1740, in the Venice edition of his *Opere*. This edition also contains, iv, 226 ff., the previously unprinted *Risposta di Felice Paciotto all' autore del giudicio della Tragedia di Canace e di Macareo*, apparently composed in 1581.)

This list, taken in conjunction with that of Professor Williams, should give a fair idea of Italian critical activities in the Cinquecento. It must, however, be noted in conclusion that the student of sixteenth-century literary criticism will also find much highly important material in the printed correspondence of the period. Two letters of Giraldi Cintio seemed sufficiently elaborate to be included in the list above; a vast number of shorter critical letters will also have to be taken into account if Cinquecento criticism is ever to be adequately evaluated.

## REVIEWS.

*Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne* by Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan. University of Michigan publications, Language and Literature, volume 1. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1925. Pp. 232.

This volume leads the reader to feel that the department of English at the University of Michigan contains an interesting and stimulating group of men, with whom students may think themselves fortunate to come into contact. The essays are evidently the work of scholars interested in their subjects and alert in the application of ideas to their material.

The first two essays, by Professor O. J. Campbell, are entitled respectively *Love's Labour's Lost Re-studied*, and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona and Italian Comedy*. It has been usual to say that the source of the first was unknown, though few students have doubted that there was a source. It now appears in historical events at the court of Navarre in the time of Henry IV. The method by which these events were made known to Shakespeare may have been the narrative of some friend at the English court who had been in Navarre. The entertainments provided for the ladies of the play are said to be influenced by the Royal Progress as it appeared in Queen Elizabeth's time. On this element Mr. Campbell probably lays too great emphasis, particularly in his suggestion that the "indefinite ending" of the play, with no certain acceptance of the lovers by the ladies, is the result of the straggling quality of the entertainments of the Progress. The study of the play as exhibiting the influence of Italy, especially of the conventional characters in the *Commedia dell'Arte*, is very interesting. Holofernes, for example, is the conventional pedant, and hence need not be supposed a satire on some particular Elizabethan scholar. The second essay disposes of the common facile condemnation of the plot of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and substitutes in the mind of the reader a historical understanding of the matter. Any one who has allowed himself to be influenced by the usual objections to the last act, and who will reread the play after becoming familiar with Mr. Campbell's paper, will find that historical study is a genuine help to artistic appreciation. Though the play does not improve when judged according to present standards, it does appear as a natural product of the conditions under which Shakespeare worked. If we still condemn, we condemn rather the age than the individual. The critical question becomes: What has Shakespeare done with the conditions imposed by his age? The subject of Italian influence on the Elizabethans is an important



one, which is now engaging the attention of a number of scholars. Mr. Campbell has given an example of good method in studying general tendencies in Italy and in furnishing a variety of examples without too much insisting on some single Italian comedy as a source.

In an article on *Shakespearian Punctuation* Professor Charles C. Fries shows that the punctuation of the early copies of Shakespeare need not be supposed to have any special or occult significance. The method of the work is admirably thorough, and the quotations from a number of Elizabethan writers on punctuation are convincing.

The most elaborate study in the volume is Professor James Holly Hanford's *The Youth of Milton: An Interpretation of His Early Literary Development*. In his *Areopagitica* Milton suggests that the most significant part of the biography of a literary man is to be found in his books. Mr. Hanford might have acted on such a theory, for he has given an admirable biographical study of the youth of Milton founded chiefly on his writings. To trace the growth of poetic powers is for all poets, above all for Milton, to trace the whole intellectual and spiritual development of the man. The study emphasizes the early appearance and harmonious growth of conceptions and methods employed through Milton's career. The continuity of his life does not show violent breaks, but fairly steady progress; differences are produced by absorption of new material, without abandonment of the gains of any stage.

The first stage is that of the influence of Sylvester's translation of DuBartas and the Fletchers. The verbal conceits of this school, says Mr. Hanford, Milton "was later to repudiate." But did he altogether? What of such lines as the following from *Samson Agonistes*?

He all their ammunition  
And feats of war defeats.

(1277-8).

Here the verbal jingle has its artistic purpose. The next influence is the Ovidian, in the manner of Buchanan, because Milton did not care to imitate the sensuousness of the English amatory poets. Without denying this, the reviewer suspects that Milton, like other chaste English poets, had more personal sympathy with Rabelaisian humor than his early poetry indicates; something of it appears in the Seventh Prolusion. Next comes the Italian influence, revealed in the Italian sonnets. This is followed by the epic period, represented by *On the Morning of Christ's Nativity*. The period of *Comus* is assigned to Spenser and Ariosto. Possibly more emphasis on Dante and even Petrarch in this period would be proper. With Spenser is associated Plato. In tracing the influence of poetical masters, Mr. Hanford does not pass over other influences of Milton's thought, such as his early interest in the theory of marriage, in politics, and in education.

While avoiding controversy, Mr. Hanford does not hesitate to reject false interpretation, such as that of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* as giving opposite views of life. This "absurd" error has been widely circulated by teachers of Milton in schools and colleges. Like Professor Osgood in the introduction to his *Classical Mythology of Milton*, Mr. Hanford makes the poems complemental and illustrative of Milton's catholicity of taste. The study as a whole is independent of early or later fixed ideas on Milton, Johnsonian or Swedish, and based on thorough and sympathetic examination of Milton's writings. Subsequent interpretation of Milton's youth may modify and supplement it, but can hardly contradict much that is essential to it.

In his paper on *Samson Agonistes and Milton in Old Age* Mr. Hanford has courageously attacked two difficult topics, the *Samson* itself and the Aristotelian catharsis, and emerged from the attempt with credit. He has emancipated himself from the grip of Samuel Johnson's comments and treated the poem with independent insight. It is the drama of Samson's regaining of "his own lost paradise." An idol of the market place that has been too zealously worshiped is swept away in the words: "Let us recognize at once that *Samson Agonistes* is a work of art and not a disguised autobiography." It seems hardly correct to call the indictment of woman in the play one of "unrelieved bitterness." The chorus in the midst of its attack on Dalila says:

Favoured of heaven who finds  
One virtuous rarely found,  
That in domestic good combines:  
Happy that house! his way to peace is smooth. (1046-9).

These lines are perhaps the more significant of Milton's own feeling because they give some effect of being forced into their context. Mr. Hanford also speaks of Samson as a "semi-humorous marchen figure" which Milton has adapted to his purpose. This is the notion of our present Biblical scholars, but not that of Milton's learned contemporaries. Samson was for them sufficiently dignified, even a type of Christ. In fact the greatest need in the critical and historical study of the *Samson Agonistes* is work on it in the light of the Biblical commentators from whom Milton derived his conceptions. Until we have this we shall attain no thorough understanding of the work. Even the structure of the drama is greatly influenced by Milton's Biblical and theological studies. Great as the Greek influence is, the formulas of Greek literature are not adequate, and the play will always seem to fail when tested by them. To apply this to some details, lines 1669 ff., referred by Mr. Hanford to the classical hybris, may also be explained by the Biblical hardening of the heart by God, as in Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* 1. 8. Lines 687 ff. are also not wholly pagan, but have some

relation to the Christian theory of the afflictions of such a one as Job, who is often mentioned in the same work (e. g., 1. 8, 19). But Mr. Hanford's feeling for the artistic qualities of the drama is sound, and his study illuminating.

In *The Religious Thought of Donne in Relation to Medieval and Later Traditions* Professor Louis I. Bredvold covers some of the same matter as does Dr. Evelyn M. Simpson in her *Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924, pp. viii, 367). Apparently the two appeared so nearly at the same time that neither author was able to consult the other. Mr. Bredvold's work is full of interesting suggestions, but the limits of space do not permit him to develop any of them in full. Perhaps the most striking, to which there is no parallel in Mrs. Simpson's volume, is his attempt to show that Donne was a philosophical sceptic, of the order of Montaigne. Sextus Empiricus is suggested as one of Donne's sources, and a quotation from him in the *Essays in Divinity* is mentioned, but the study is not carried to a conclusion. Mr. Bredvold states that the first Greek edition of the *Hypotyposes* was printed in 1562, though authorities commonly make this only a Latin translation, and put the *editio princeps* of the Greek text in 1621. A Latin translation of the work *Against the Mathematicians* was issued in 1569 and 1601, and there was an important fourteenth century translation of the *Hypotyposes*. As an indication of scepticism even in Donne's sermons Mr. Bredvold presents (p. 203) two quotations from one sermon, part of one being:

One philosopher thinks he has dived to the bottom, when he says, he knows nothing but this, that he knows nothing; and yet another thinks, that he hath expressed more knowledge than he, in saying, that he knows not so much as that, that he knows nothing (Alford 3. 472).

From the same sermon is taken a quotation in which Donne "reproaches his age for the slowness with which the new science was accepted." When the passages are in their context, the reviewer is unable to see that they reproach the age or approve scepticism; the sermon deals with the transitory quality of human life, in comparison with the incorruptible blood of Christ. Mr. Bredvold also refers to Donne's reference to "sceptic philosophers" in another sermon (Alford 5. 562). But here Donne does not approve their ideas, and passes on to a condemnation of "sceptic Christians." Still further Donne writes:

The Negative man, that trusts in nothing in the world, may be but a Philosopher, but an Atheist, but a stupid and dead carcassee. The Affirmative man, that does acknowledge all blessings, spirituall and temporall, to come from God, . . . this man hath the first marke of this person upon him, *He trusts in God* (*LXXX Sermons*, 63. 636, quoted by Mrs. Simpson, p. 129).

In *Essays in Divinity* he remarks that "the Distortions and violence of Scriptures, by Christians themselves, have wounded the Scriptures more, then the old Philosophy or *Turcism*" (pp. 81-2, quoted by Mrs. Simpson, p. 206). "Turcism" is doubtless Mahometanism, chief of heresies, and the "old Philosophy" is Greek philosophy, from which sprang, as the Fathers thought, most of the heresies that troubled the Church. As a learned Churchman Donne would have gained some familiarity with sceptical ideas for the sake of refutation. But he plainly expresses faith in the understanding in the following from a sermon:

Be not the horse or the mule, in pride or wantonness especially, *quia non intellectus*, because then you lose your understanding, and so become absolutely irrecoverable, and leave God nothing to work upon: for the understanding is the field which God sows, and the tree in which he engrafts faith itself; and therefore take heed of such a descent as induces the loss of the understanding (Alford 2. 50).

Such a passage may be taken to express Donne's reaction against a discarded youthful scepticism. In the following he rejects the conception employed in the poem on *The Progress of the Soul*:

God doth not admit, not justify, not authorize such superinductions upon such divorces as some have imagined; that the soul departing from one body, should become the soul of another body, in a perpetual revolution and transmigration of souls through bodies, which hath been the giddiness of some philosophers to think (Alford 3. 469).

Donne must have had his earlier work in mind when writing these lines. On the whole, Donne's scepticism seems to be a matter of his earlier work; indeed is there reason to think that it had ever had a philosophical basis, or was more than cynicism? Augustine and Aquinas seem to be Donne's philosophical masters, rather than Sextus Empiricus. The study is of service in reminding us of the possible importance of Greek thought in the intellectual and spiritual development of Western Europe, from late antiquity, through the middle ages, and up to our own day. It is to be hoped that Mr. Bredvold's work will stimulate others to undertake parts of this important, fascinating, and difficult subject.

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

*Duke University.*

---

*Dante's Conception of Justice*, by ALLAN H. GILBERT. Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1925. ix + 244 pp.

Judging from its Press, the new University, with its almost boundless possibilities, is making a good start. It puts before us a considerable list of promising titles; and, if Professor Gilbert's work is to be taken as a fair specimen, the promise will be amply

fulfilled. As to material form, the volume is neat and unassuming, the print excellently clear, the paper of good quality; and there is none of the abominable waste in blank pages and enormous margins which nowadays inflates the bulk of nearly all our literary output, making a hundred-page composition look like three hundred pages, the publishers all the while tearfully attributing their skyscraping charges to the high cost of paper. No, this is a sensible little volume; and if its price (\$2.50) seems a bit out of proportion to its size, the purchaser at any rate is not exasperated by the display of wilful extravagance. Moreover, if value be measured by content rather than by exterior, the Press's rating is justified.

For this is an excellent piece of work, one of the really significant contributions to Dante scholarship. So obviously needful and helpful is the discussion that one is surprised the matter should have been so long neglected. There are really two starting points. One is the *Convivio*, where, in the project which he did not actually carry out, Dante expected to furnish a treatise on justice; this, no doubt, would have elaborated his theory. The other is the plan of the *Commedia*, a working out of the poet's theoretical conception, an application of his abstract idea to the realities of life. From one point of view the whole *Divine Comedy* is an exposition of the various manifestations of justice. Indeed, its author so regarded it, when he wrote the Letter to Can Grande. "Est ergo subiectum totius operis, litteraliter tantum accepti, status animarum post mortem simpliciter sumptus; nam de illo et circa illum totius operis versatur processus. Si vero accipiatur opus allegorice, subiectum est homo prout merendo et demerendo per arbitrii libertatem iustitie premiandi et puniendi obnoxius est."

Professor Gilbert begins, then, by reconstructing the background from which Dante's notion of justice emerged. Setting before us the sources which our poet indubitably consulted, the author develops for us the ideas of individual and social equity which they inculcate. Such sources are St. Thomas's *Summa*, Aristotle's *Ethics* in Latin version, and above all St. Thomas's commentary on the latter. With passages from these are matched sundry utterances of Dante himself in the *Monarchia* and the *Convivio*; and in the end we have in our minds a fairly definite outline of the treatise which Dante promised but never wrote.

The illustration of Dante's thesis, in the *Commedia*, is handled by Professor Gilbert with understanding, with judgment, and with a consistency worthy of all praise. Especially noteworthy is his application of consequent exegesis to the *Purgatorio*, where most commentators have been deplorably sloppy, explaining one punishment as a symbol of sin, another as a symbol of penance, and thus

reducing this beautiful *cantica* to a jumble of incongruity. Every torment here must be an allegory of discipline; else the whole scheme is meaningless. Of course Dante, in common with his contemporaries, believed in a multiplicity—an endless multiplicity—of possible significances in the events of life, in the narratives of the Bible, and in the verses of great poets; but he was not the man to lose his head in such a maze. We do see him occasionally reading into passages of Virgil a message which the words do not declare, and he certainly did it far oftener than we can see; just as he read into his own early poems an inner sense of which he was not conscious when he wrote them. Yet there was always in his interpretation a method that saved it from madness. We must judge him, not by the practice of ingeniously unpoetic minds, but by his own. And his mind and his practice were rigorously selective. "Forse ancora per più sottile persona si vederebbe in ciò più sottile ragione; ma questa è quella ch'io ne veggio, e che più mi piace."

But no two Dante critics will ever agree in everything. Among the debatable contentions in the present book, perhaps the most interesting is the suggestion that the infernal valley of Ulysses and Guido da Montefeltro depicts, not the sin of deceitful counsel, a perversion of the gift of words, as is commonly believed, but general foxiness. This carries with it a negation of the interpretation of the enveloping flames as tongues. "I cannot believe," writes Professor Gilbert, "that the tongues of the sinners are allegorically represented by the flames. . . . This bolgia may properly be called that of tricksters or strategists, but not that of fraudulent counsellors." True it is that the sins of Ulysses and Diomed here recounted are faults of deed rather than of word, and that Guido's damnable advice is intended to help rather than hurt the person to whom it is given, being a counsel of fraud rather than a fraudulent counsel. On the other hand, the logical demon who wins Guido's soul attributes his conquest to "il consiglio frodolente" which the sinner gave. It is hard to decide. But whichever solution we prefer, whether in accord with Professor Gilbert or against him, we cannot fail to admire, here as elsewhere, his independence and his judicial balancing of evidence.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

*Harvard University.*

---

*Altfrisisches Wörterbuch* von F. Holthausen [Germ. Bibl. IV. Abt. I]. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1925. xviii + 152 pp.

This book is, as the author states in the Preface, a concise glossary of Old Frisian planned to serve as a basis for subsequent studies in this Germanic dialect. No examples are given. Almost every

word is accompanied by one or more parallel forms from Gothic, Old Norse, Anglo-Saxon, Old Saxon, or Old High German. It is difficult at times to see why the author chooses the form of one dialect rather than that of another. For instance, after 'dād' *tot* he gives the Old Saxon, Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse forms; for 'fella' *fullen*, the Gothic, Old Norse, Old Saxon, Anglo-Saxon and Old High German; then again for 'del' *Tal*, only the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon forms. The Latin and Old French loan-words are usually followed by their originals.

Besides containing some 1800 words (all starred) more than von Richthofen's dictionary, which appeared in 1840, all etymologically long vowels are marked, the single vowels with the usual sign (bōk), contractions of diphthongs with the circumflex (stēn). In spite of these decided advantages over von Richthofen which the book has, the student will not yet be able to dispense with the former because of the examples there given. Especially valuable in Holthausen's book is the complete bibliography of the published texts and articles on the Old Frisian language and laws.

There are comparatively few errors for a work of this kind. The following have been noted: page 1, insert after 'ā-pāl' the word 'ā-pōl' *Wasserpfuhl*, found Richthofen, *Wörterbuch* page 607, and in Heuser, *Altfriesisches Lesebuch*, page 58; page 3, instead of Old Saxon 'and-weard' read 'and-ward'; page 14, for 'dēađ-gedāl' read 'dēađ-gedāl'; page 73, for 'minnian' read 'minnion,' and delete 'go.', for the word 'mōdar' is not found in Gothic; page 110, for 'þei' (Gothic instr.) read 'þe'; page 137, Holth. states that 'ē-bēte' *ohne Busse* (page 18) should be crossed out, but both Richthofen, page 697 (with occurrences) and Heuser, page 131 give it; page 138, 'fai' should not be starred because found in Richth., page 724; 'festnia' is starred, but not on page 26 (Richth. gives 'festna'); page 141, read 'defraudare' for 'drefraudare.' If 'dādsisas' *Totenlieder* is taken from the *Indiculus superstitionum et paganarum* (Wadstein, *Altsächs. Sprachdenkmäler*, page 66), as I think it is, for I know of no other occurrence of the word, it should be so stated. Misreadings in Richthofen, especially where they have led to the incorporation of impossible words (mostly *ἀναξ λεγόμενα*) into the Old Frisian *Wortschatz* should have been noted and the correct reading given.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

Gettysburg College.

---

*Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies.* Published Quarterly by the Mediaeval Academy of America. Boston, January, 1926.

*Modern Language Notes* extends greetings to *Speculum*, a new mirror through which students of the modern languages may

become more richly conscious of their medieval heritage. Our greetings are the more cordial since it was in Baltimore, when the Modern Language Association met at the Johns Hopkins University in 1921, that we saw the beginnings of the enterprise which now culminates in the establishment of *Speculum* and of the Academy of which it is the organ. Of the significance for research in the humanities which this movement connotes, there is no need to speak. The officers of the Academy and the editors of the journal are men who have won distinction in the classics, in history, in architecture, and in modern languages. This is a heartening fact, since one great need of modern scholarship is collaboration among workers whose fields have much in common but who are kept apart by the artificial "departments" of college catalogues. There is also reason for congratulation in the fact that both medieval specialists and scholars whose primary interests lie outside the Middle Ages may find, in *Speculum*, monographs, notes, and reviews which deal with a single great period of human culture. Our present system of handling journals of research, while it has much in its favor, is open to the serious objection that matters of every conceivable sort are contained in periodicals that have now become so numerous that few individuals can afford the cost of subscribing to them all, and that owing to our hit or miss system of publication it is only with the greatest difficulty that a student can be sure of finding all that is published that bears on his particular field. Toward the development of a more highly specialized service *Speculum* leads the way.

The papers which will appear in this journal, we are told, are not to be directed toward "the popularization of matters well-known" but toward "what is new, in fact or statement or interpretation"; they are not to scorn small details, "but details must tend towards a significant goal." Since "art and beauty and poetry are a portion of our mediaeval heritage," all will be represented in studies which are first of all scholarly; but this "scholarship must be arrayed, so far as possible, in a pleasing form." It is apparent, both from these statements from the editor's preface and from the contents of this first issue, that *Speculum* will not be dull; that "mirrors of history and doctrine and morals" may be combined with "mirrors of princes and lovers and fools"; that the journal will combine detailed scholarship with synthesis; and that both detail and synthesis will be matters of high import to students of modern history and literature as well as to specialists in the Middle Ages.

In the first issue of Volume I, destined to be read, we think, a century hence when Volume C appears, the three opening papers constitute an invocation, a history, and a "speculum." From the invocation, the admirably written preface by Professor Rand, some



quotations have already been made. Professor Coffman, who has worked unceasingly for five years in furtherance of this project, gives the historical background and the prospect necessary to proper orientation. In the third paper, on "The Spread of Ideas in the Middle Ages," Professor Haskins not only supplies an important chapter to the general history of ideas but maps out lines of research that will no doubt find many illustrations in later publications of the Academy. Following these initial essays, we find a group of more specialized investigations, such as the discussion of the vocabulary of the *Annales Fuldensis* by Professor Beeson and the learned paper on the progenitors of Golias, by Professor Hanford. Professor Friend's article on two MSS of the school of St. Denis is richly illuminated by six plates. Professor Young reviews previous discussions of the home of the Easter play with special reference to the contention of Dr. Joseph Klapper, which he rejects. Professor Thornton supplies a critical edition of the four poems ascribed to the Emperor Frederick II and "Rex Fredericus." The book contains also a section devoted to "Notes," and concludes with a group of reviews of books dealing with medieval problems.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

---

*La Jeunesse d'Ernest Renan, Histoire de la Crise Religieuse au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* By Pierre Lasserre. Paris, Garnier, 1925. Vol. I, vii + 370 pp.; Vol. II, xxxv + 359 pp.

In 1923, for the Renan centenary, M. Lasserre published a little book, *Renan et Nous*, in which he promised for the near future a definitive work on this author. He now produces—and it becomes evident that the title of the first chapter of *Renan et Nous*, "Un Travail qui n'en finit pas," was an omen—two ample volumes with a statement that he no longer expects to reach the term of his labors. He has followed the subject where it led, and it has brought him to a new and exhausting kind of writing, of tremendous scope, not yet classified by bibliographers.

Comment le définir? Un exposé d'histoire générale des idées encadrant l'étude d'un grand écrivain dans sa période de formation? Ou plutôt l'étude d'un grand écrivain s'épanouissant naturellement en un exposé d'histoire générale, sous l'attrait des horizons vastes que cette étude découvre, et des amples questions que soulèvent nécessairement la nature, les expériences, les conceptions et l'action de cet écrivain? (I, vi)

After all, he says, the definition is not important. What matters is that in spite of the change of itinerary the reader shall be aware of a goal. "L'essentiel, c'est qu'entre les matières si diverses que j'ai dû toucher, le lecteur sente un lien d'unité profonde, et que,

le long du chemin que je lui fais faire, mon souffle n'ait pas défailli." (I, vii)

A casual reader might be tempted to quote Scherer's acid remark about Taine's *Philosophy of Greek Art* to the effect that although Taine gives two hundred excellent pages on Greece, you have but to omit six lines from the beginning and the book will be found to contain not a word of art and not a word of philosophy. Especially in the case of M. Lasserre's second volume, where Renan is simply left out. His occasional deprecatory gesture reminds one of Sainte-Beuve's apologies for making *Port-Royal* a survey of seventeenth-century civilization; he acknowledges that he has at no point resisted the sweetness of curiosity, and he remarks whimsically to the reader: "Tu te diras: voici un homme qui nous a promis un paquet de cigares et qui est parti pour La Havane chercher le tabac en feuilles. Et ma foi! c'est un peu ça!" Yet what he offers is not a mass of irrelevancies but a conspectus necessary for the proper placing of Renan; at the end one is impressed not with the apparent digressions of the author who if he opens a parenthesis never forgets, as the truly garrulous would, to close it, but with his genius for correlation.

In the first volume his methods are sufficiently orthodox. He follows Renan from Tréguier to St-Sulpice, supplementing the familiar sources by reference, without "abus de paperasseries," to school-registers and to the Renan collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale. For the amateur of the unedited various prizes are offered, including this anecdote (an impressive authentication of Renan's "j'ai tout critiqué . . . j'ai tout maintenu") reported orally by La Villemarqué:

Un jour La Villemarqué, visitant St-Pierre de Rome, aperçut à l'un des angles de l'église un vieillard, épais et tassé de corps, avec de longs cheveux gris, dans l'attitude du recueillement et de la prière. Il n'en croyait pas ses yeux! Ce ne pouvait être lui! Pourtant le doute n'était pas possible. Il attend son homme en dehors. "Quoi! vous, vous, Renan, en ce lieu, et dans les sentiments que je viens d'observer! Quelle joie pour mon cœur de catholique!"—Et Renan: "Ah! mon cher confrère, si vous saviez combien elle est mince, la toile d'araignée qui nous sépare!" (I, 26)

But already in this volume M. Lasserre indulges in excursions, as in his study of the conversion by Dupanloup of that mitred infidel, Talleyrand,—and as we begin to understand what charmed the sophisticated Talleyrand in Dupanloup we also begin to see why the Breton pupil of Dupanloup might make reservations and we get as never before the full psychological significance of the reactions of the adolescent Renan.

With a similar purpose, in order this time to comprehend what his student years meant for the philosophy of Renan, M. Lasserre devotes his second volume, "le Drame de la Métaphysique Chrétienne," to what lay back of the teachings of St-Sulpice. He gives

three hundred and fifty pages of metaphysics and theology, pages of which the lucidity is a delight and a flattery but to appraise which exceeds the competence of the present reviewer (who with his lesser power of correlation stops so much further short, be it said without innuendo, of *omni re scibili*).<sup>1</sup>

It was a bold man who attempted such a canvas. But M. Lasserre has already persuaded the reviewer of the *lien d'unité profonde* without the promised third volume which when it does appear will no doubt contain the author's final clue to some sound order and authority. M. Lasserre is not an apostle of drift. And we are aware as we read these volumes, indispensable not only to students of Renan but to the observer of contemporary criticism, that he is holding the steady course on which he embarked years ago. This is the Lasserre of the *Cinquante Ans de Pensée Française*, the critic of the pseudo-heroics of Rostand in *Mes Routes*, and also the stout humanist of the 1907 *Romantisme Français* (*Essai sur la révolution dans les idées et les sentiments au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*). Except that he is now more suave.

HORATIO E. SMITH.

*Brown University.*

---

*Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England, (1660-1830),*  
by A. F. B. Clark, Associate-Professor of French in the University of British Columbia. Paris (Champion), 1925.

Professor Clark has won the respect and gratitude of students of English, of French and of Comparative Literatures by his masterly study of the influence of Boileau and of French classical theories in England during the period from 1660 to 1830. Originally begun as a dissertation for the doctorate and showing even in its original form a maturity of judgment not always seen in American academic treatises, it has grown as a result of many years of further investigation to the scope and proportions of a French doctoral thesis, with which it can well bear comparison. It gives evidence of thorough sifting of the English authors during a period of nearly two centuries and it attests by reference and quotation the assimilation of a vast fund of critical material. Above all, the critical tone is judicious and the influence of Boileau is explained without undue praise or depreciation of Boileau himself. This study will be an essential document for consultation by students of the literary relations of France and England. Many sweeping generalizations, favorable or unfavorable, have hitherto been made concerning the

<sup>1</sup> For an estimate of the philosophical value of this "élégante et solide construction," cf. Roustan, "le Drame de la Métaphysique chrétienne d'après M. Pierre Lasserre," *Revue Bleue*, Oct. 3, 17, 1925.

influence of French classical criticism. We are now able to see on what these generalizations are based and wherein they are true or false.

The author's first book deals with the external history of Boileau's reputation in England, and the ups and downs of his vogue. It shows how the first to introduce Boileau to England were the Court Poets of the Restoration and how the traditional view that Boileau's influence came into operation only after Dryden's death is false. It was, however, during the Age of Pope that his sway was least disputed. But by the middle of the eighteenth century a cleavage begins: Boileau has his detractors; sometimes among partisans of "correctness," as well as his loyal admirers. The process of dissociation of Boileau from his English disciple Pope has begun, until with Byron we come to the hitherto irreconcilable attitude of worship of Pope and hatred of Boileau.

The second book enumerates and discusses the translations and imitations of Boileau. This portion is inevitably the least inspiring portion of the study to the reader, involving as it does the analysis of many now negligible works, and detective labor applied to the discovery and presentation of parallel and derived passages. On the other hand it is the severest test of a scholar's industry, memory and judgment.

The third book brings before one a subject intimately associated with the question of Boileau's specific influence, the whole school of French critics of which he is now almost the only one remembered. Professor Clark has, as in his study of the tradition of Boileau, traced the other French critics who are the object of treatment or of allusion by English writers. Thus the background of Boileau is made plain and we have brief sections upon the Aristotelian formalist d'Aubignac; the law maker of ponderous epics, Le Bossu; the suave authority upon true and false wit, Bouhours; and Rapin whose doctrines, because they are on the whole very similar, are sometimes difficult to disentangle from those of Boileau.

It is in the fourth and last book that Professor Clark deals most fully with the specific influence of Boileau on English literature and his contribution to English poetry and criticism. Here is grouped a series of chapters forming compact essays on the relation of Boileau to the English Christian epic as a consequence of his own aversion to the *merveilleux chrétien*; Boileau's differentiation between the burlesque and the mock-heroic and his enthronement of dignified *badinage*, exemplified by the *Lutrin* and the *Rape of the Lock* in place of the undignified trivialities of Scarron; his assault on the Italianistic tradition and the cult of the *clinquant du Tasse*; his worship of Longinus and the new meaning he gave to the word "sublime," changing it from a designation merely of literary ornateness to the expression of "cet extraordinaire et ce merveilleux dans le discours, et qui fait qu'un ouvrage enlève, ravit,

transporte." The author next treats the themes which in themselves require considerable tact and judgment: the relation of Boileau to the School of Good Sense and the School of Taste. Then follow briefer discussions of topics connected with the study of Boileau as moral critic and exponent of the *honnête homme*, as well as consideration upon the influence of Boileau on English prosody or on an English *genre* such as formal satire.

Professor Clark completes his work with appendices containing various documents difficult of access. It may be said in conclusion that the accuracy of the proofreading and the general neatness of the typography are creditable not only to the author but to the French firm of printers.

*Harvard University.*

C. H. C. WRIGHT.

---

*Paris-Théâtre Contemporain. Rôle prépondérant des scènes d'avant-garde depuis trente ans.* By LOUISE DELPIT. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, VI, nos. 1 and 2. Paris, Champion, 1925. xi + 125 pp.

Après le Dadaïsme, voici le Théâtre Contemporain. Félicitons les professeurs de Smith College de s'adonner aux études de littérature moderne, et souhaitons que toutes les Universités d'Amérique, suivant leur exemple, préparent à nos descendants des textes à consulter sur notre XX<sup>me</sup> siècle.

On ne saurait trop louer Mlle Delpit de sa très sérieuse étude. Sur un terrain presque vierge, elle a fait de nombreuses recherches dont elle nous présente les résultats sous une forme claire et agréable. Son ouvrage est divisé en deux parties: 1°, Les Théâtres; 2°, Les Auteurs et les Œuvres. La classification des salles de spectacles en: Théâtres réguliers, Théâtres d'avant-garde et Scènes à côté, est excellente; et on se réjouit de voir Mlle Delpit rendre pleine justice aux efforts d'Antoine, de Lugné-Poe et de Jacques Copeau. Elle retrace la carrière de chacun, explique leur rôle, dégage leur importance, dans des pages certes meilleures que celles où elle nous vante les mérites de la Comédie-Française. L'opinion trop avantageuse qu'elle a de cette maison lui a fait adopter, dans la deuxième partie de son livre, une classification qui nous semble assez malheureuse. Le chapitre 1<sup>er</sup> s'intitule, en effet: Auteurs consacrés par la Comédie-Française. Comment Mlle Delpit peut-elle prendre au sérieux les opinions d'un théâtre qui,—elle le dit elle-même,—a mis vingt-neuf ans à enregistrer le succès d'Ibsen? Le jour où elle étudiera le roman, classera-t-elle ses auteurs d'après les élections de l'Académie? Cela l'obligerait à parler des chefs-d'œuvre littéraires de M. Jonart ou du maréchal Lyautey, et à passer sous silence M. Abel Hermant, comme elle l'a déjà fait pour

le théâtre. Certes, l'auteur du *Cadet de Coutras* est plus romancier que dramaturge, mais il a cependant écrit une quinzaine de pièces, dont la dernière, *Madame*, date de 1924. Sa personnalité est, sans doute, plus intéressante que celle de M. Marcel Girette. Mais Abel Hermant n'a jamais été joué au Français, tandis que M. Girette y a fait représenter deux pièces: L'une d'elles a reçu un prix, l'autre, l'approbation de M. l'abbé Bethléem. M. Girette a toutes les chances. Marie Lenéru est moins fortunée. Sa dernière oeuvre, *La Paix*, ayant été jouée à l'Odéon (1921), n'est que mentionnée incidemment. De telles erreurs d'appréciation sont inévitables quand on s'appuie sur un critérium dénué de toute valeur.

Si la classification du premier chapitre prête à la critique, celle du deuxième est, en revanche, tout à fait ingénieuse. Mlle Delpit a démêlé le mieux du monde l'écheveau embrouillé de la production dramatique contemporaine. Sa division du théâtre religieux en deux parties: Avant Claudel et Après Claudel, est particulièrement heureuse, car elle fait ressortir, comme il convient, l'importance de l'illustre diplomate. Ses compartiments établis, l'auteur, avec beaucoup de discernement, y place les auteurs et leurs oeuvres. C'est à peine si l'on éprouve parfois quelque surprise. Pourquoi, par exemple, ne pas classer *Cromedeyre-le-Vieil* dans le théâtre poétique? Est-ce parce que les vers de Jules Romains offrent peu de ressemblance avec ceux de François Porché que Mlle Delpit ne les considère pas comme de la poésie? Mlle Delpit aime beaucoup François Porché. C'est affaire de goût. Le genre "pompiers" a toujours eu du succès, surtout près des dames. Mais souhaitons que cet amour reste tout platonique et ne donne pas naissance à une édition pour les collèges de *La Vierge au grand cœur*. Nous avons déjà, hélas! *Le Chevalier de Colomb*. C'est plus que suffisant. Publier du Jean Sarment ne vaudrait guère mieux, quoi qu'en pense Mlle Delpit qui, dans Henry Bataille qu'elle déteste, ne trouverait certainement pas de pièce aussi révoltante que *Je suis trop grand pour moi*, et l'odieuse *Madelon*. Au lieu de se retrancher derrière Lucien Dupech, Mlle Delpit eût mieux fait de consulter les *Critiques d'un autre temps* (1923) de Copeau. Elle y aurait trouvé une plus juste appréciation des défauts et des qualités de Bataille qui restera, n'en déplaise à ses détracteurs, et malgré ses fautes de goût, un de nos plus admirables dramaturges.

Une bibliographie sommaire termine cette étude où l'auteur, sans sortir du domaine de l'érudition, évite cependant la sécheresse, grâce à de courtes analyses des pièces qu'elle énumère. Elle s'efforce également de qualifier d'un mot certains écrivains. C'est toujours inutile et souvent périlleux. André Gide, par exemple, aimerait-il s'entendre appeler: "un maître du roman contemporain," lui qui, lors de la récente publication des *Faux Monnayeurs*, affirmait que c'était là son premier roman?

Au reste, ce ne sont que des petites fautes bien vénielles qui n'empêchent point *Paris-Théâtre Contemporain* d'être la première étude d'ensemble, le premier document complet que nous ayons sur le théâtre français au XX<sup>me</sup> siècle, et Mlle Delpit a le droit d'être fière à la pensée que nul ne pourra désormais s'occuper de dramaturgie moderne sans devoir perpétuellement recourir à son très remarquable ouvrage.

MAURICE E. COINDREAU.

*Princeton University.*

---

*Gespräche mit Heine. Zum erstenmal gesammelt und herausgegeben von H. H. HOUBEN. Frankfurt a/M., 1926, Rütten & Loening. xiv + 1071 pp. M. 15.*

Professor Houben's collection is an attempt, and a successful one, considering the magnitude of the task, to gather between two covers all known material left by contemporaries of Heine wherein they record their conversations with, and impressions of, him. Purposely excluded from this compilation is the material found in Heine's *Sämtliche Werke*, that in Hirth's *Briefwechsel*, and the information published by Karpeles in his *Heine Reliquien*. Houben's book thus forms a complement to these sources and entails no duplication.

The title is a bit misleading, however, for it contains not only conversations with Heine, but also contemporary reports about him; *Gespräche mit und über Heine* would have described its contents more adequately.

This somewhat loose title is no indication, however, of a corresponding looseness in the composition of the book. On the contrary, the extensiveness of the material, the care exercised in the chronological arrangement, the completeness of the notes, foot-notes, and variants bespeak sound, practical scholarship. The very task of placing in chronological order these various conversations, references, and reports would have presented unsurmountable obstacles to any one not thoroughly at home in the field. Houben was exceptionally qualified for this task: his *Register* (vol. xv) to the fourteen volumes of Varnhagen von Ense's *Tagebücher*, his editions of the works of Laube and of Gutzkow, his *Zeitschriften des Jungen Deutschland*, etc., bear witness to it.

A large part of the material, to be sure, was chronologically fixed by the original reporters, yet a not inconsiderable portion had to be taken from sources where exact dates were generally lacking, such as Madame Jaubert's *Heinrich Heine—Erinnerungen aus den letzten 20 Jahren seines Lebens*, or Heinrich Börnstein's *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre in der Alten und Neuen Welt*. It is in cases such as these that Houben's intimate knowledge of the period shows

itself clearly, not to mention those frequent instances where the reporter's memory fails him and Houben can correct wrong dates and prevent confusion.

The plan of the book to marshal forth this complicated material in chronological sequence makes it most valuable because by means of this close juxtaposition, the reports from the mouths or pens of different people correct or modify one another or even prove without argument the untrustworthiness of some of them or their originators. But, of course, there are also some cases where one is baffled by serious contradictions in equally credible reports and knows not which way to turn.

The bulk of the material presented by Houben has been known to Heine scholars, at least bibliographically, but it is to his great credit to have now made easily accessible to any one all the material bearing upon this point, much of which was unobtainable without going to Germany. For the most part, Houben availed himself of printed sources and there are over 200 of them; but he added 17 passages from unpublished manuscripts taken chiefly from Varnhagen von Ense's *Nachlass* in the Prussian State Library in Berlin. A glance at his *Quellenverzeichnis*, pp. 999-1038, is in itself a proof of the wealth of the material submitted, and its detailed cross-references as well as the complete index, pp. 1039-1071, will be appreciated by any user of the book.

The present reviewer can add but one item to Houben's material: a conversation F. A. Strubberg claims to have had with Heine in Paris toward the end of the latter's life. It is published as a bit of literary curiosity by P. A. Barba in his *Life and Works of Friedrich Armand Strubberg* (*Americana Germanica*, xvi, 148-9, 1913).

The spirit of Houben's book is essentially that of Hirth's admirable *Briefwechsel*, one of strict objectivity having but the one aim to give as complete and dependable a piece of work as care and diligence can make it. Typographically, the edition is excellent, printed on good paper and well-nigh letter perfect; these 1000 pages disclosed but three misprints which are in fact rather proofreader's misunderstandings: p. 250, in Houben's note, *Anfang* should read *Anhang*, for it is in the *Anhang* to the *Romantische Schule* that we find Heine's satire on Victor Cousin; p. 824, line 16 *einen* should read *keinen*; p. 830, No. 692, line 3, an *ist* should be deleted. The headings of each page, stating in a word or phrase the respective contents of each, seem to the present reviewer quite gratuitous, of no help, rather misleading at times, and merely a concession to the general reading, and buying, public in order to make the book appear more "chatty" and friendly. The intrinsic merit of Houben's book is, however, not affected thereby.



*Lettres de Madame de La Fayette et de Gilles Ménage*, publiées avec une introduction, des notes et un index par H. ASHTON, Liverpool, The University Press, 1924. 199 pp.

This is a painstaking edition, in which, however, not every textual difficulty, due to the editor's separation from his materials, in Vancouver, could be absolutely overcome. This same embarrassment may be further discerned in matters of comparative convention, and a sufficient sophistication, or room for its bearing in mind, if present, as to France and England at any rate, in that age, as before and since. If we do not look back to Charron, de Thou, and du Vair, for a kind of prevision Stoicism of positive flavour, the *Anatomy of Melancholy* is scarcely farther away than the *Traité sur les Passions de l'âme* of Descartes, and Dorothy Osborne's Letters are barely ahead.

Meantime, if the sceptre of Malherbe has not wholly fallen, nor the long influence of the *De Tranquillitate animi* and the *Consolatio ad Marciam* been wholly resolved, Cicero's Letters as model, the *Provincial Letters* as immediate example, are giving a new definition to the Classic norm; and this belongs to the salon relation, too. Pascal's correspondence with Mlle de Roannez is something more than a curious sort of sentimental torture in the Grand Siècle and the purlieus of Jansenism, and Mme de La Fayette's with Ménage must not be read into a feeble echo on the sentimental side, in simple historical justice. This *personne vraie* was voted, first in her own generation, and since at every fair tribunal, *point sentimentale*.

We may indeed press very closely, and the closer the better, La Rochefoucauld's famous coinage, a fresh prose translation for the humanistic-mystical sincere of "sincère profession," a phrase that has lingered on even in English along with those "inordinate and sinful affections" against which *mesure* is forming out of the late Scholastic summary, *Temperatio inter utrumque moderamente utentes*. And in the larger social sense, in which, as in the narrower, we have to take note of these friendships, it is surprising on a scrutiny that does not ignore for example, the *Apology* of La Rochefoucauld how much of the Cardinal Virtues of the old courtly tombs passes, only a little more laicised and composed in aspect, into the official conscience of the only too earnest and *chagrin* provincial governor. Pity becomes almost obsession to the real mood and to an alarmed Stoicism equally, *bel esprit* languishing with its vapours, till it wishes it had no pity at all with the need of exercise for *l'âme bien faite*. This passes in its own exaction beyond the *tête bien faite* of Montaigne that let him off perhaps a little easier, though this relative ease, too, must not be taken by any means overliterally.

The heart of the genre, and its own *je ne sais quoi*, in the con-

text, seems in Madame de La Fayette's combination of these sentiments, before the grief of a mother, for instance, "la plus violente douleur du monde," passing that of the victim, "car enfin, quand on est mort on ne souffre plus." Authentic, in our modern translation, the note is for the Century as for universal moralist perception, like Mme de Sévigné's "et Monsieur de La Rochefoucauld est toujours mort." Poignant it is, but in another fashion than that of our more modern fashionings, for the most part, of our emotion, and Taine's guidance with respect to this moment may remain a safer and surer than some more recent vivacities of an over-personal approach.

We have to be grateful to the imagination of Mr. Ashton for giving us a diplomatic text of what is so precious as data for recovering possibly a little more tact and poise in our reading of *Le Grand Siècle*, and not its least authentic and poignant figure. *Ménage* needed no special rehabilitation, but it may be added that the Letters in no way add to the need.

Hartford, Connecticut.

MAUD ELIZABETH TEMPLE.

*A German-English Dictionary* by HERMAN C. G. BRANDT. New York, G. E. Stechert & Co., 1925. viii, 962 pp., lex. 8°, \$4.00.

"The Dictionary is intended as a convenient handbook for American and English students of the German language. It was the author's aim to give under each word just the information that is necessary for correct and ready interpretation and usage, and no more." These sentences from the Preface succinctly and adequately state the aim and scope of the late Professor Brandt's work. By wise restraint in the addition of secondary meanings, the author has been able to produce a dictionary in which the fundamental significance of a given word can readily be found. Furthermore, compound words are, as a rule, given as new entries, so that the key-word is at the beginning of the line: of the compounds of *Reichs-*, for example, there are 29 separate entries, whereas in most other dictionaries the words in question would have to be sought under one entry, in the interior of a paragraph. Any one who has waded through such columns of compounds will at once realize the saving of time by the present arrangement, particularly as the type used for the key-words stands out in bold relief.

With many words, etymology and cognates in other languages are indicated. Here an antiquated derivation has now and then been allowed to stand, *e. g.*, when *Pistole* is connected with the Italian city of Pistoja. In this connection it must be remembered that the work was finished a number of years ago. All in all, it seems to be one of the very best books of its kind, well worth a trial in advanced college classes.

Johns Hopkins University.

W. KURRELMMEYER.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

May, 1926

Number 5

---

## "STANDING WATER"

In the fifth scene of the first act of *Twelfth Night* the shipwrecked Viola, posing as a youth named Cesario, has come in her "masculine usurp'd attire" to woo the Lady Olivia for her master, the Duke Orsino. Her entrance to the lady's house is barred by the watchful steward Malvolio, who is nevertheless compelled by her insistence to announce her presence to Olivia. Thereupon this dialogue ensues between the mistress and her steward:

*Olivia.* Tell him he shall not speak with me.

*Malvolio.* He has been told so; and he says he'll stand at your door like a sheriff's post, and be the supporter to a bench, but he'll speak to you.

*Olivia.* What kind o' man is he?

*Malvolio.* Why, of mankind.

*Olivia.* What manner of man?

*Malvolio.* Of very ill manner; he'll speak with you, will you or no.

*Olivia.* Of what personage and years is he?

*Malvolio.* Not yet old enough for a man, nor young enough for a boy, as a squash is before 'tis a peascod, or a coddling when 'tis almost an apple; 'tis with him in standing water, between boy and man. He is very well-favoured and he speaks very shrewishly; one would think his mother's milk were scarce out of him.

The crux of this passage—though it must be admitted that most editors of the play have hardly felt it to be one—is the statement, " 'tis with him in standing water, between boy and man." For the moment I shall merely call attention to the fact that all of Malvolio's references to the supposed youth Cesario are highly contemptuous, and, leaving this cryptic remark for later reference, I shall now record the notes which have been written to explain the clause, " 'tis with him in standing water."

The Variorum edition of the play reproduces the notes of two commentators, Capell and Wright. Both of these notes concern themselves with the bearing of the word "in," and ignore the consequent phrase "standing water." Capell regards the word as an error, and substitutes "e'en." Wright inclines to accept the original reading as correct, and ventures this explanation: "The phrase, if the reading be correct, must mean 'in the condition of standing water.'" The Variorum editor (Howard Horace Furness) emphatically and properly endorses this note, and with that we may leave our consideration of the word "in." There is no doubt whatsoever that, so far as the preposition is concerned, the phrase signifies "in the condition of standing water." Furness proceeds, however, with this suggestion for the interpretation of the whole phrase: "*Possibly*, the simile was drawn from the tides at London Bridge. In the *Tempest*, II, 1, 236, Sebastian says, 'I am standing water,' where, as the context shows, he means just at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor rising." This explanation of "standing water," as we shall see, is the recurrent one in the notes for both *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest*, the two plays in which the phrase appears.

Rolfe, in his edition of *Twelfth Night*, reproduces Schmidt's note: "*In standing water*. That is, between the ebb and the flood of the tide." He agrees with this interpretation, and quotes the parallel instance from *The Tempest*, II, 1, 221; "Well, I am standing water."

Professor Walter M. Hart, in his notes for the Tudor edition of the play, gives the same explanation with equal confidence: "*Standing water*. Water at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor flowing."<sup>1</sup>

In the notes on this passage, then, we find a virtual unanimity, and the diffidence of the earlier editions gives way to a complete confidence in the later ones. A good while ago I began to feel dissatisfied with these explanations. There did not seem to me to be any special disparagement in the comparison of a young man to a river standing poised between its tidal ebb and its tidal flow,

<sup>1</sup> N. E. D., however under the word *standing*, II, 7, gives the definition: "Of water, a piece of water: Still, not ebbing or flowing, stagnant," and quotes the passage from *Twelfth Night*.

and, furthermore, it seemed quite certain to me that Malvolio was searching his precise brain for every unsavory simile that he could fit to the case. While I was considering these things, my memory, the warder of my own poor brain, brought in the recollection of an afternoon, years past, when I was discussing certain grave matters with an ancient and illiterate countryman of mine. We were being interrupted and annoyed from time to time by the housewife, who was less interested in our high discourse than she was in the occasional wagon that passed down the road and the sporadic sails that appeared from time to time out on the bay. The natural chagrin which my old friend was enduring constrained him to make the following apology, delivered to me in cautious undertones: “Melissy,” he said, “is what ye would call a little queer. She isn’t crazy, but no more could ye say that she’s wise. She’s like a swamp that’s neither land nor water, and she doesn’t know enough to hold her tongue when gentlemen are discoursin.’”

In this true tale, I believe, is contained the same contemptuous simile which Malvolio applied, with a different interpretation, to the impudent young intruder who insisted on delivering his message “will you or no.” I must on no account base my conclusion on an anecdote which the sceptic might suppose me capable of trumping up *ad hoc*, and I shall have more substantial proofs to offer presently. My next step shall be to scrutinize the parallel passage in *The Tempest*.

In the first scene of the second act of this play the King of Naples and his companions are wandering aimlessly about the island after the supposed wreck of their ship. Wearied with their exertions, the King and most of his company lie down on the ground and go to sleep. The only ones who remain awake are Sebastian, the shifty brother of the King, and Antonio, the usurping Duke of Milan. The latter has attained his dukedom through treachery, and he is now anxious to make a pupil of Sebastian, who, as he thinks, may easily attain an even higher position by the same method. The following conversation passes between the two friends.

*Antonio.*

Noble Sebastian,

Thou let’st thy fortune sleep—die, rather; wink’st  
While thou art waking.

- Sebastian.*                               Thou dost snore distinctly;  
   There's meaning in thy snores.
- Antonio.*                               I am more serious than my custom; you  
   Must be so too, if heed me, which to do,  
   Trebles thee o'er.
- Sebastian.*                               Well, *I am standing water.*
- Antonio.*                               I'll teach you how to flow.
- Sebastian.*                               Do so; to ebb  
   Hereditary sloth instructs me.

The Variorum edition of the play quotes only one comment—that of Jephson—on Sebastian's rejoinder, "Well, I am standing water." The comment is this: "The meaning seems to be, 'I am stagnant, slow of understanding and action; for Antonio follows up the metaphor by saying he will teach Sebastian how to flow, and Sebastian rejoins that his natural or hereditary slothfulness teaches him rather to ebb.'" It is impossible to decide from the vague wording of this note what definition is intended for the phrase "standing water," but one may surmise that the burden of defining is simply avoided. Furness himself makes no comment here, but it will be recalled that he pronounced thus on this passage while considering the same phrase in *Twelfth Night*: "Sebastian says, 'I am standing water,' where, as the context shows, he means just at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor rising."

Rolfe's note, like Jephson's, may be based on what I should consider a right understanding of the phrase, but it, also, carefully avoids a specific explanation. It runs thus: "*I am standing water*—I am passive, ready to listen to you and to be influenced by you."

Professor Herbert E. Greene, in his notes for the Tudor edition of the play, is explicit enough. His comment on the passage is: "*I am standing water.* I am quiet, between ebb and flow, ready to listen."

Let us now proceed independently with this passage from *The Tempest*. When Sebastian says, "Well, I am standing water," he quite obviously means, "Well, I am in a state of passivity. I am not doing or saying anything. Go ahead and say what you obviously wish to say." Now, both Antonio and Sebastian are inveterate punsters, quibblers, and corruptors of words. In every conversation in which they bear a part they regard a sentence as

but a cheveril glove to a good wit. Therefore, when Sebastian defines himself *figuratively* as "standing water," Antonio immediately pounces upon the *literal* meaning<sup>2</sup> of his phrase, pretending, according to the well-known rules of the wit combat, not to have realized that it was meant figuratively. "I'll teach you how to flow," he says, which, in effect, means, "You are stagnant water, are you? Well, I'll teach you to be running water." But he has used the word "flow," which has a double meaning, and Sebastian immediately counters on him by seizing on the second or unintended meaning—*flow* as against *ebb* in the cycle of the tide. "Do so," he says, "To ebb hereditary sloth instructs me."

That is, "standing water" does not suggest flow *and* ebb, as Furness contends, but "standing water" suggests "flow" to Antonio, and "flow" *independently* suggests "ebb" to Sebastian. And, it may be remarked as an aside, this is the only interpretation that can give life or meaning to the situation. The whole passage, as I have quoted it, is a wit combat or it is nothing, and if "standing water" suggested *both* flow and ebb, then Sebastian, instead of countering nimbly on his friend according to his custom, merely phrases a stupid rejoinder which, since it was implicit in his first speech, was obvious from the start.

The plays of Shakspeare afford countless instances of the wit combat, and the rules of the game can easily be deduced from these examples. It is a contest in which each participant eagerly watches for some weak point in the last remark or rejoinder of his opponent—some phrase which can be interpreted in a way not intended or foreseen by the opponent, and which is quickly twisted into this new meaning and flung back in his face. I have selected, almost at random, a passage of words between Romeo and Benvolio which will serve as well as any other to illustrate the verbal duello. It is a trifle more extended than the bout between Sebastian and Antonio, but every pass in it is made in accordance with the same familiar code.

*Benvolio.* Tell me in sadness, who is that you love?

*Romeo.* What, shall I groan and tell thee?

---

<sup>2</sup> It is not strictly necessary to insist upon the application of both figurative and literal in this wit combat. The purpose of my explanation will

- Benvolio.* Groan! Why, no;  
But sadly tell me who.
- Romeo.* Bid a sick man in sadness make his will. . . .  
Ah, word ill urg'd to one who is so ill!  
In sadness, cousin, I do love a woman.
- Benvolio.* I aim'd so near when I suppos'd you lov'd.
- Romeo.* A right good mark-man! And she's fair I love.
- Benvolio.* A right fair mark, fair coz, is soonest hit.
- Romeo.* Well, in that hit you miss. She'll not be hit  
With Cupid's arrow; she hath Dian's wit;  
And, in strong proof of chastity well arm'd,  
'Gainst Love's weak childish bow she lives unharm'd.\*

At every turn of this dialogue there is some particular word that serves as the instrument of attack—a word which may be used in different senses, and which, as soon as it is used by one speaker in one sense, is pounced upon by the other speaker in another sense and hurled back at his antagonist. The first of these is “sadness,” used by Benvolio with the meaning “soberness.” It is seized at once by Romeo, is given another of its meanings—“grief”—and, thus transformed, is returned to Benvolio. A little later Benvolio gives a skilful twist to the word “fair,” which Romeo has unsuspectingly used, attaches it to the word “mark,” which has also appeared in his opponent's last speech, and scores a very palpable hit. And so on, until Romeo has the last word.

To every skilled practitioner of the wit combat, then, it was obvious that his skilled rival could be scored against only by a quick, subtle twist in some variable word which the rival himself had used in his last remark. No student of *The Tempest* need be told that Sebastian and Antonio are verbal duellists of the first house, and no student of the science of verbal fencing need be persuaded that they are crossing foils in the passage under dispute.

## II

The passages which I have cited from *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest* are the only ones in which Shakspeare employs the definite phrase “standing water,” and this absence of parallel instances in Shakspeare's own writing is probably the cause of what I consider a

be served equally well by supposing that Antonio is here applying an unexpected figurative extension to Sebastian's remark.

\* *Romeo and Juliet*, Act I, Scene 1, ll. 205-217.



current misapprehension, since in neither of these passages is the meaning obviously unambiguous. It is doubtless well known that Shakspeare, and his contemporaries also, frequently couple such words as “pool,” “pond,” and “lake” with the epithet “standing,” and I shall attempt to show presently that these phrases are all synonymous with the phrase “standing water,” but I propose first to consider some passages from contemporary Elizabethan writing which contain the actual phrase “standing water.”

The King James version of Psalm 107, verse 35, is: “He turneth the wilderness into a *standing water* and dry ground into watersprings.” Here the phrase is undoubtedly a dignified one, and is equivalent to “a lake,” or, as an Elizabethan would say if he preferred to do so, “a standing lake.”

In Book II, Chapter 6 (1587 edition), of the *Description of England*, Harrison discourses upon “the food and diet of the English,” and, since beer and ale played a constant part in the process of nourishing the Elizabethan body, he devotes some space to a consideration of the best methods for brewing these nutritive drinks. “In this trade,” he says, “our brewers observe very diligently the nature of the water, which they daily occupy, and soil through which it passeth, for all waters are not of like goodness, sith *the fattest standing water* is always the best; for, although the waters that run by chalk or cledgy soils be good, and next unto the Thames water, which is the most excellent, yet the water that standeth in either of these is the best for us that dwell in the country, as whereon the sun lieth longest, and fattest fish is bred.” Here the distinction is clearly made between “standing water” and water that runs—continuously or through the alternate processes of ebb and flow, as the case may be. Here, also, the phrase is a comparatively dignified one, for the simple reason that Harrison adopts a respectful tone in using it because he considers it a valuable fluid for the purpose in hand. Uttered with a change of tone the phrase “fat (i. e., thick, or even slimy) standing water” may quickly degenerate into a disgusting expression, as we shall presently see.

In *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Part I, Sec. 2, Mem. 2, Sub. 1.) Burton considers, under the successive headings “Beer” and “Waters,” the same domestic topic that is handled by Harrison in

the chapter from which I have just quoted, and he considers it with a difference. "*Standing waters*, says Burton, "thick and ill-coloured, such as come forth of pools, and moats, where hemp hath been steeped, or slimy fishes live, are most unwholesome, putrified, and full of mites, creepers, slimy, muddy, unclean, corrupt, impure, by reason of the sun's heat, and *still-standing*; they cause foul distemperatures in the body and mind of man, are unfit to make drink of, to dress meat with, or to be used about men inwardly or outwardly. They are good for many domestic uses, to wash horses, cattle, &c, or in time of necessity, but not otherwise. Some are of opinion that such *fat standing waters* make the best beer, and that seething doth defecate it, as Cardan holds, *Lib. 13 subtil.* 'It mends the substance and savour of it,' but it is a paradox."

### III.

These quotations from contemporary Elizabethan writings will, I believe, make it quite clear that the phrase "standing water" was a familiar and established one as applied to water that does not run or that is not subjected to the processes of ebb and flow. It is equally important, however, to understand that this phrase could be varied, according to the whim of the speaker or writer, by such phrases as "standing pool" and "standing lake," and the link may be supplied by another quotation from the same subsection in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* from which I borrowed my last quotation. Under the heading "Fishes" Burton comments thus: "Rhasis and Magninus discommend all fish, and say they breed *viscosities*, slimy nutriment, little and humorous nourishment. Savanarola adds, cold, moist: and phlegmatic, Isaac; and therefore unwholesome for all cold and melancholy complexions: others make a difference, rejecting only among fresh-water fish, eel, tench, lamprey, crawfish (which Bright approves, *Cap. 6*), and such as are bred in *muddy and standing waters*, and have a taste of mud, as Franciscus Bonsuetus poetically defines, *Lib. de aquatilibus*.

Nam pisces omnes, qui stagna, lacusque frequentant,  
Semper plus succi deterioris habent."

This Latin quotation is thus rendered into English in a parallel column, by Burton:

All fish that *standing pools and lakes* frequent  
Do ever yield bad juice and nourishment.

It is obviously unnecessary to add any comment to the evidence of this definitive quotation. The gloss on "*stagna, lacusque*" of the Latin passage, and on "standing pools and lakes" of the English translation, is, in contempt of question, "muddy and standing waters."

The case, I suppose, may now be regarded as proved, but for the sake of finality of treatment I should like to subjoin three instances—out of many available ones—that will show the easy variability of the substantive that could be conjoined with the constant attribute "standing" in Elizabethan conversation.

When Prospero abjures his potent art in the first scene of the final act of *The Tempest* he begins by apostrophizing the different groups of spirits that have aided him in his mastery over the elements.

Ye elves of hills, brooks, *standing lakes*, and groves,  
And ye that on the sands with printless foot  
Do chase the ebbing Neptune, and do fly him  
When he comes back—

These are the first two groups in his list, and in delimiting the spheres of their activities he places the "standing lakes" in a category distinct from that containing the water which ebbs and flows. The word "standing" definitely marks that distinction in this passage, but it does not include the idea of stagnancy in any unpleasant sense. In the two passages that follow, however, the presence of that idea is obvious.

The "Sir Oracle" speech in the first scene of *The Merchant of Venice* is so well known that it may be presumed that the recollection of every reader of Shakspeare who is condescending to my pedantry will already have supplied it. "There are," says the sprightly Gratiano,

a sort of men whose visages  
Do cream and mantle like a *standing pond*  
And do a wilful stillness entertain,  
With purpose to be dress'd in an opinion  
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit.

The second line of my citation refers, of course, to the gathering of scum on the surface of stagnant water, and the remaining lines

fix the comparison of this unwholesome phenomenon with the assumption of a cloak of dignity and reticence on the face of the would-be wise man. The important word in this second line, I believe, is "standing," in the sense of "stagnant." The substantive "pond" I believe, by the same token, to be accidental, and synonymous with "water" or "pool" or any other term that could lend itself to the idea of fixity in the most common of liquids.

In *The Duchess of Malfi*, Act I, Scene 1, the villain Bosola expresses this cynical opinion of the Duke Ferdinand and the Cardinal his brother:

He and his brother are like plum-trees that grow crooked over *standing pools*; they are rich and o'erladen with fruit, but none but crows, pies, and caterpillars feed on them.

Here, one need hardly contend, we have a disgusting picture of the battenning process beside a swamp or a shallow pool of filthy water, and here also, as in the preceding quotation, it is obvious that the speaker is pointing his sarcasm with the same comparison—used with a difference—that Malvolio borrows for the nonce to discredit young Cesario.

#### IV.

On the negative side, then, the phrases "standing pond," "standing pool," "standing lake," and "standing water" are all synonymous, and they all denote, in common, the absence of progressive motion or of the alternate motions of ebb and flow. On the positive side there are minor distinctions in Elizabethan usage which may be deduced readily enough from the quotations that I have presented. "Standing ponds" and "standing pools" are swamps, marshes, or collections of thick and stagnant water. The "standing lake" is—ordinarily, at least—the larger, deeper and more dignified body of water that stands in its place without flow. "Standing water" is any or all of the others, and, in any given instance, it is what the speaker who refers to it will indicate by the tone of his reference or by his contextual phraseology. In the Biblical passage that I have cited, for instance, the phrase is obviously synonymous with "standing lake."

We may complete the circle by returning to the passages in *The Tempest* and in *Twelfth Night*. In the former passage the phrase "standing water" is clearly used in its general negative sense

denoting passivity or absence of motion, and here, as I have shown, the phrase provokes a verbal attack with flowing water which, in its turn, receives a counter attack with flowing-and-ebbing water. In the latter passage the phrase, uttered as it is in a bitterly sarcastic tone, just as clearly denotes the "standing pond" or "standing pool." I have already explained that my interpretation of Malvolio's contemptuous response to the question, "Of what personage and years is he?" would run, in part, as follows: "If you ask me how old this person is I can only answer that he is neither a boy nor a man, but is in that amorphous state lying between the two. He is like a swamp, which is neither dry land nor running water." This simile, like the ones preceding it in the same speech, has the powerful virtue of making its object seem ridiculous, and I think that even Malvolio would realize that he could hardly expect to raise the laugh against his antagonist by comparing him to a river nobly poised for an instant before returning to its banks.

W. ROY MACKENZIE.

*Washington University.*

---

### MILTON'S "OLD DAMOETAS"

Which of the fellows or tutors of Christ's College Milton had in mind when he wrote of 'old Damoetas' matters as little, for a real understanding of *Lycidas*, as which of his companions were the 'rough Satyrs' and which the 'Fauns with cloven heel.' Most of the editors of Milton, when they attempt any identification, have settled on Chappell. "Old Damoetas," says Masson, for example,<sup>1</sup> "is either Chappell, whom Milton has long forgiven, or some more kindly fellow of Christ's." Surely, however, all that one learns about Chappell contradicts the idea that he "loved to hear the song" of the students. Milton's early troubles aside, Chappell seems to have been recognized by all who knew him as a man who was respected rather than liked by his students, whereas Milton's line implies some intimacy and affection. Chappell sent out better-trained students than did any other teacher of the college; he was

<sup>1</sup> Masson, David, *Life of Milton*, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1859, I, 611.

the finest disputant in the university; but students and adversaries alike looked back upon their encounters with him with admiration for his intellect, hardly with real feeling for the man himself. Although identification of *Damoetas* with other than Chappell makes little real difference in our understanding of Milton, yet there is some interesting evidence in regard to the matter which may at least throw light upon a man with whom Milton undoubtedly came in contact during his undergraduate years.

Milton was not the only student of Christ's who introduced a kindly tutor into one of his pastoral poems. During the last year of the life at Cambridge of the "lady of Christ's," there matriculated at the college a youth whom his classmates came to call the "angel of Christ's." There were many similarities, other than the nicknames, between Milton and Henry More, afterwards the founder of the Cambridge Platonists, and one of the most influential theologians of his day. Strikingly similar in appearance in their youthful days, both combined interest in poetry with intense interest in theology. In their reactions to Cambridge they had much in common. Later, it is true, More, who had been trained a Calvinist, was to find his place with the latitudinarians, urging toleration in religious belief during those very years while Milton fought with the Puritans and then retired to write *Paradise Lost*, but in their undergraduate days, both showed to a marked degree a fusion of Renaissance and Puritan ideals. Like Milton, More contributed to many of the Cambridge volumes of 'occasional verse'; his Greek elegy on Edward King appears in the same volume which contains *Lycidas*. Like Milton also, More, after completing his university training, turned to the writing of poems, which, in his own day, were certainly more seriously considered by men of intellect than had been the minor poems of Milton, for More was a philosophical poet, who sang "those rythmes which from Platonick rage do powerfully flow forth."

The first of these 'rythmes,' given to an interested—though frankly puzzled—world in 1642, More called *Psychozoia or the Song of the Soul*.<sup>2</sup> Involved and confusing though the allegory is—a combination of Plotinus, Philo Judaeus, Ficino, Pico della

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Poems of Dr. Henry More*, edited by Alexander B. Grosart, Chertsey Worthies Library, 1878.

Mirandola, Chaucer, Spenser, and possibly a dozen other of More's favorites—it offers to the Milton student a curious parallel for Milton's pictures of the Cambridge students who

were nursed upon the self-same hill,  
Fed the same flock by fountain, shade, and rill.

The second and third cantos of More's poem deal with the story of a pilgrimage, told by an old shepherd to younger swains who gather about him for instruction. His pastoral name is not Damoetas, but Mnemon, but he is like Milton's shepherd, one who loves and is loved by a younger generation. The scene in More's poem is evidently laid in some such garden as that of Christ's:

We on grassie bed did lie prostrate,  
Under a shady Beach, which did repell  
The fiery scorching shafts which Uriel  
From Southern quarter darted with strong hand.

The real affection which existed between the teacher and his students is evidenced again and again by their interruption and eager questions and by his replies to them. Such an interlude as this is characteristic: a student to whom More gives the name Subtimidus has hesitated to ask a question of the old shepherd, not knowing how it will be received; but he is reassured when he sees the courtesy and kindness with which Mnemon replies to the ingenuous question of another student.

Subtimidus, when Tharrhon sped so well,  
Took courage to himself and thus 'gan say  
To Mnemon: Pray you Sir vouchsafe to tell  
What Autaparnes and Hypomone  
And Simon do this while in Dizoie.  
With that his face shone like the rosie Morn  
With maiden blush from inward modesty.

Then More comments:

Old Mnemon lov'd the Lad even from his face,  
Which blamelesse blush with sanguin light had dyed.

The story which More's Mnemon tells is of his youthful wandering through the strange countries of Beirah (the brutish life), Psittacusa-land (the country of parrot speech), Dizoia (the country of 'double-livednesse'), until he finally achieved Psychania, the

land of the spirit. Beneath its complex allegory, one may read the story of a man whose youth was a period of doubt, making for scepticism, but who finally achieved what was to him the serenity of belief. Now in his age he is telling the tale to a youthful generation in an attempt to keep them from that fruitless wandering. There is little doubt in the mind of anyone who has read the rest of More's poetry that this scene is founded upon reality. His allegory, usually abstruse and chaotic, becomes for the time being almost clear, and often really interesting; his portraits are of individuals, not, as in the rest of the poem, of philosophical abstractions; most of all his portrait of Mnemon rings true.

Was there, then, any fellow of Christ's who corresponded to Milton's 'old Damoetas' and to More's Mnemon? Certainly it was not Chappell; and it was hardly Robert Gell, More's tutor during a good part of his Cambridge life. But in every way the impression which Milton and More give of this "more kindly fellow of Christ's" does suit that best-loved of all the fellows, Joseph Mead, famous for generations after his death as the author of *Clavis Apocalyptica*, an interpretation of the Book of Revelation which long remained a standard text in theological study.<sup>3</sup> Born at Berden, Essex, in October, 1586, Mead was educated at Christ's College, to which he returned as fellow, and to which he devoted his life, refusing the many tempting offers of preferment which came to him. He was a Renaissance figure in the varied interests which occupied him. He was, says a biographer, "an acute Logician, an accurate Philosopher, a skilful Mathematician, an excellent Anatomist, . . . a great Philologer, a master of many languages, a good proficient in the studies of History and Chronology."<sup>4</sup> Christ's rightly looked upon him as her greatest man and tradition tells that other colleges used to call him in for consultation particularly in connection with studies in anatomy. It was not his

<sup>3</sup> The most interesting account of Mead is that given in *Biographia Evangelica* by the Rev. Erasmus Middleton, London, printed by R. Denham, 1784, III, 73-95; see also the *Dictionary of National Biography*; Masson, *Life of Milton*, I, 101 ff.; Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*. London, James Black, 1813, II, 429-434; Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, London, Strahan, 1870, I, 167. There are many letters in Heywood and Wright, *Cambridge University Transactions*, London, Henry Bohn, 1854.

<sup>4</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 75.



intellectual interests alone, however, which made him Damoetas and Mnemon.

His chamber, on the first floor of Christ's, was the center of the college life. Not a student but knew his windows; indeed, if we may trust tradition, it was not unusual for the students to play pranks upon him, in connection with that window, but they were the pranks of affectionate mischief. To suggestions that he change his quarters, he merely smiled; he liked to be in the midst of things. And in the midst of things he was; no fellow was so popular, none had such communication with the outside world. In spite of the amount of work he did, he kept up an active and lively interest in affairs of the nation and of Europe; he subscribed to a weekly news-letter, the contents of which he used to pour forth enthusiastically at the commons table; he was the correspondent of many of the important men of Europe. To Hartlib (that curious figure who seems to have written to everyone) he wrote of the doings of Cambridge and the country about. He was a true gossip! It was seldom he missed anything, and when he did he was the first to enjoy the laugh on himself. Thus when Emmanuel College in 1622 chose a new Master so secretly that Mead did not know they were to do it until it had been done, he wrote, "Never did I believe till now I see it experienced, that so many as 12 could keep counsell a week together, and fellowes of a colledg too! Who would have thought but there would have bin one Judas among 12!"<sup>5</sup> He was, by all accounts, a charming correspondent, a delightful companion.

But it is in his relations with his students that he is most important. So far as one may judge by contemporary accounts, these relations were not limited to a small group who happened to be entered under him. He was not a mere tutor. Under ordinary circumstances, that part of his time which he devoted to instruction should have gone to lectures, but, unfortunately, he had a slight impediment in his speech, and so declined to lecture except when it was utterly necessary. Instead he felt it his duty to devote that time to more informal talks with students. His biographer says:<sup>6</sup>

He preserved his knowledge in academical learning by the private lec-

---

<sup>5</sup> Heywood and Wright, *Cambridge University Transactions*, II, 312.

<sup>6</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 77 ff.

tures which he read to his pupils, to whom he was an able and faithful guide. For being a fellow of a college, he esteemed it a part of his duty to further the education of young scholars; which made him undertake the careful charge of a tutor; and this he managed with great prudence and equal diligence. After he had by daily lectures well grounded his pupils in Humanity, Logic, and Philosophy, and by frequent converse understood to what particular studies their parts might be most profitably applied, he gave them his advice accordingly; and, when they were able to go alone, he chose rather to set everyone his daily task than constantly to confine himself and them to precise hours for lectures. In the evening they all came to his chamber, to satisfy him that they had performed the task he had set them. The first question which he used to propound to every one in his order was, 'Quid dubitas?' 'What doubts have you met in your studies today?' for he supposed that to doubt nothing and to understand nothing were verifiable alike. Their questions being propounded, he resolved their quæres and so set them upon clear ground to proceed more distinctly; and then, having by prayer commended them and their studies to God's protection and blessing, he dismissed them to their lodgings.

Thus Milton and More might have come into unusually personal contact with Mead even though he was in no sense a tutor of either of them. His biographer says again (*ibid.*, III, 83):

He was far from affecting an unprofitable, inactive solitude; for none was more free and open for converse, especially with ingenuous and inquiring scholars. Let who would repair to him, provided they were not captious and impertinent, he would give them their fill of discourse and enlarge to ample satisfaction.

Read in connection with Mead's own life, the allegory of More's *Psychozoia* takes on a new meaning, for Mead had, in his youth, experienced a period of religious and philosophical doubt very similar to the situation Mnemon describes (*ibid.*, III, 74 ff.):

Not long after his entrance into philosophical studies, he was for some time disquieted with scepticism, that troublesome and restless disease of the Pyrrhonian school of old. For, lighting upon a book in some neighbor-scholar's chamber . . . he began, upon the perusal of it, to move strange questions to himself and even to doubt whether the τὸ πᾶν, the whole frame of things, as it appears to us, were any more than a mere phantasm or imagination. The improvement of this conceit . . . rendered all things so unpleasant to him, that his life became uncomfortable. He was then but young, and therefore the more capable of being abused by those perplexed motions, by which Pyrrho had industriously studied to represent the habitation of truth as inaccessible. But, by the mercy of God, he quickly made his way out of those troublesome labyrinths.

What more natural than that, in his intimate talks with students entering upon the period of adolescent doubt, he should have told them, allegorically or otherwise, the story of his youth, which More remembered so vividly?

More, it is true, pictures Mnemon as an old man, whereas Mead died in the prime of life, at the age of fifty-two. Yet More says himself that his figure of "ten times ten times ten" is a mere Pythagorean symbol, signifying the perfect life; then, too, conventions of the pastoral decree that the teacher-shepherd must be old; or may we possibly see here another evidence of the fact that to youth teachers are of a generation which has passed away! Apart from this one discrepancy, we may see a definite parallel between More's description of Mnemon, and a contemporary description of Mead. More says:<sup>7</sup>

. . . few things I will relate,  
Of which old Mnemon mention once did make.  
A jolly swain he was in youthfull state,  
When he mens natures gan to contemplate,  
And kingdomes view; but he was aged then  
When I him saw; his years bore a great date;  
He numbred had full ten times ten times ten;  
There's no Pythagorist but knows well what I mean.

Old Mnemons head and beard were hoary white,  
But yet a chearfull countenance he had:  
His vigorous eyes did shine like starres bright,  
And in good decent freez he was yclad.  
As blith and buxom as was any lad  
Of one and twenty cloth'd in forest green:  
Both blith he was and eek of counsell sad:  
Like winter-morn bedight with snow and rine  
And sunny rayes, so did his goodly Eldship shine.

In many of the details the description undoubtedly recalls this one of Mead:<sup>8</sup>

His body was of a comely proportion, rather of a tall than low stature. In his younger years (as he would say) he was but slender and spare of body; but afterwards, when he was full-grown, he became more fat and portly, yet not to any excess. . . . His eye was full, quick, and sparkling. His whole countenance was composed to a sedate seriousness and gravity;

<sup>7</sup> *Psychozoia*, Canto II, stanzas 30 and 31.

<sup>8</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 90.

*Majestas et Amor* were well met there: an awfull majesty, but, withall, an inviting sweetness. His behavior was friendly and affable, intermixed with a becoming chearfulness and inoffensive pleasantry. His complexion was a little swarthy, as if somewhat overtinctured with melancholy.

Whatever the other similarities between Mead and the mysterious Mnemon, there is no question that the lesson which each endeavored to teach to his students was the same:<sup>9</sup>

When Mnemon hither came, he leaned back  
Upon his seat, and a long time respired.  
When I perceived this holy Sage so slack  
To speak (well as I might) I him desired  
Still to hold on, if so he were not tired,  
And tell what fell in blest Theoprepy;  
But he nould do the thing that I required;  
Too hard it is, said he, that kingdomes glee  
To show; who list to know himself must come and see.

This story under the cool shadowing Beach  
Old Mnemon told of famous Dizoie;  
To set down all he said passeth my reach,  
That all would reach even to infinity.  
. . . Suffice it then (he) taught that ruling Right,  
The Good is uniform, the Evil infinite.

MARJORIE H. NICOLSON.

Goucher College.

## THE SYNTAX OF *THE* WITH THE COMPARATIVE

There is in Old English a variation of the regular construction of comparison which may be indicated by the example, *þon mā þe*. This locution often baffles the translator and has usually been treated as sporadic in spite of the fact that it is to be found throughout the entire Old English period. It disappears in Middle English, the only trace left being the word, *lest*, *lest* (from *þy lās þe*). My discussion of the syntax of this construction falls under three heads: first, fixing the locution as an established *idiom* of Old English; second, the syntax of the pronoun, *þon*, (or *þy*, or *þē*) preceding the comparative; third, the syntax of the particle, *þe*, which follows the comparative. My analysis will incidentally

<sup>9</sup> *Psychozoia*, Canto III, stanzas 69, 70, 71.

throw light on that difficult fossil construction, Mod. Eng. *the* with comparative.

Examples of the idiom are not confined to any one dialect of Old English, nor to any single part of the period; this eliminates the possibility of scribal error to account for such a special use of the particle, *þe*.

From the poetry (ed. Grein-Wülker):

*Daniel* 264.—næs him se swæg to sorge ðon mā ðe sunnan scīma.

*Whale* 80.—nāgon hwyrfst nē swice ūtsiþ æfre, þā þær in cumað, þon mā þe þā fīscas, faraðlācende, of þæs hwæles fenge hweorfan mōtan.

*Metres of Boethius* 28, 36.—ne bið hīo on æfen nē on ærmorgen merestrēame þē nēar þe on midne dæg.

*Metres of Boethius* 10, 38.—ne mæg mon æfre þý ȝð ænne wræccan his cræftes beniman þe mon oncerran mæg sunnan onswīfan.

*Psalms* 118, 11.—forðon ic on minre heortan hýdde georne, þæt ic þīnre spræce spēd gehealde, þý lās ðe ic gefremme fyrene ænige.

From the prose:

*Saxon Chronicle* 755 (Parker).—þā cwædon hīe þæt hīe hīe þæs ne on-munden þon mā þe ēowre gefēran þe mid þām cýninge wærun. (Laud ms.—þonne mā þe).

*Saxon Chronicle* 1009 (Laud).—ac wē gýt næfdon þā geselða nē þone wurðscipe þ sēo scīpfyrd nyt wære ðisum earde þē mā þe heo oftor ær wæs.

*Boethius, Consolation* xxxiv, 1 (Sedgfield, 83, 3).—næs of þām læssan þæt mæste þon (þē) mā þe sīo ēa mæg weorþan to æwelme.

*Ibid.* xxxiv, 10 (Sedgfield, 91, 12).—ne ðearft þū nō be þām gesceaftum twēogan þon (þē) mā þe be þām oþrum.

*King Edgar's Canon of Penitents* vii (Thorpe, *Laws and Institutes*, II, 280).—nē ænig man ne mæg synna būton andetnesse wel gebētan þē mā þe sē mæg wel hāl wurðan.

*Alfred's Martyrs*, Dec. 13 (ed. in *The Shrine*, Cockayne, 154, 22).—nis mē þīnes weales hāmed nǣfre þē lēofre þe mē nǣdre tō slite.

*Ælfric's Grammar, De Numero* (ed. Zupitza, 253).—and hī nǣfre ne atēoriað on naðrum getele þē mā þe on cāsum.

*Ælfric's Lives* (Skeat) I, 7, 20.—and þæra māðma ne rōhte þē mā þe rēocendes meoxes.

*Ælfric's Homilies, Shrove Sunday*, (Thorpe) I, 154, 18.—nis heo hwæðere ðē gelicore ðære ecan worulde, þe is sum cweartern lēohtum dæge.

Wūlfing (*Syntax Alfred*, § 65, 3) cites the following from Alfred:—

*Cura Past.* (ed. Sweet) 309, 3.—ðonne ne burne se weliga ðē swiður on ðære tungan ðe on oðrum limum.

*Ibid.* 318, 18.—ðæt hīe . . . ne hīe selfe ðý betran ne talien þe ðā oðra.

*Boethius* (ed. Cardale) 48, 22.—*þon mā þe þū wistest.*

*Similarly, ibid.* 340, 20; 364, 4.

*Ibid.* 232, 8.—*þē mā þe be þæm ǽþrum.*

*Similarly, ibid.* 288, 10.

*Ibid.* 282, 23.—*ne biþ se cwuca þonne nyttra þe se dēada.*

*Soliloquies St. Augustine* (ed. Cockayne) 201, 34.—*hē . . . þeah ne  
þincð ūs hwilum þē brādder þe ān scyld.*

*Laws of Alfred* (ed. Schmid) 76, 2 (ed. Thorpe) 1, 66 (ms. E).—*gif hīo  
bearn gestriene, næbbe þæt þæs ierfes þon māre þe sīo mōdor.  
(ms. B.—nā māre þonne sēo mōdor.)*

The general form of this idiom may be represented as

*þon* (or *þȳ*, or *þē*) + comparative + *þe* (relative particle).<sup>1</sup>

As far as I can determine, the idiom does not occur in any other language than English. In Old Saxon *than mer the* occurs (cf. *Heliant*, 1395), but it is not our English idiom at all; it is there used in a proportional statement and not in the comparison of inequality.

This quasi-comparative use of the particle, *þe*, occurs only twice to my knowledge without the preceding *þon* (*þē*, *þȳ*).<sup>2</sup> We are dealing, therefore, with a construction quite different syntactically from ordinary comparison. The fact is that in the idiom under discussion both the preceding *þon* and the following *þe* are together equivalent to the particle, *þonne*, of the regular construction. It is to be noticed that most of the examples are formed on *mā* (*māra*), and that with *mā* and *lās* the expression became

<sup>1</sup> The chance occurrence of *þe* after the comparative in the meaning, "who," "which," or "because," to introduce a relative clause or a subordinate clause other than the clause of comparison, should not be confused with the idiom under discussion. Such chance occurrences are *Beowulf* 488, 1436, 2880; *Genesis* 1325; *Metres of Boethius* x, 20 and xii, 20.

<sup>2</sup> The sole example of *þe* after the comparative in the *Saxon Chronicle* without a preceding *þon* (*þē*, *þȳ*): namely, 901 A. D. (Parker ms.), *lās þe xxx*, is probably a scribal error for the regular *þonne* or *þanne*. Compare *ibid.* 1048, *mā þanne XX*. The only other example in Old English of which I am aware occurs in *Blickling Homilies*, *EETS*, 58, p. 215:—*twām lās þe twēntig wintra*. But compare *Saxon Chronicle* 641, *hē riwode twā lās XXX gēara*; and 643, *sē wæs biscop ān lās XX wintra ond II mōnðas*, where the comparative particle is omitted altogether. All of these may be due to careless copying of manuscripts.

stereotyped and as a consequence more difficult to analyze. For instance, *þȳ lǣs þe*, which is the etymological basis of Modern English *lest*, had by the end of the Old English period lost its connotation of comparison and by giving up the recognition of its separate parts had assumed the shade of meaning bound up in Modern English *lest*.<sup>3</sup>

Translators and grammarians have treated this idiom as merely an irregular sort of substitute for the formula of comparison; none have recognized it as a locution enjoying wide use in Old English; and no attempt has been made to analyze the construction syntactically.<sup>4</sup> Being confined to Old English, it probably arose some time before the earliest records, flourished in a limited degree beside the regular construction of comparison without ever becoming a serious rival, and appears in the literature in the stage of decline, gradually disappearing. Naturally, it persisted longest in the stereotyped forms with *mā* and *lǣs*, but in these forms, like all fossilized expressions, it underwent a shift in meaning from that originally implied in the constituent elements.<sup>5</sup>

## II

I shall now examine the common construction of *þon* (or *þē*, or *þȳ*) plus the comparative, which constitutes a part of our idiom. Representative examples are:

*Saxon Chronicle* 937 (Parker ms., *Brunanburh* 43).—*gelpan ne þorfte beorn blandenfeax bilgeslehtes, eald inwidda, nē Anlāf þȳ mā.* ("nor Anlaf more than that one: namely, the previously mentioned Constantinus").

*Elenā* 96.—*Cýning was þȳ hlǽra ond þē sorglēasra, secga aldor, on fyrhðsefan þurh þā fāgeran gesyhð.* ("The king, the chief of men,

<sup>3</sup> For example, in the verse cited above from the *Psalms* (118, 11) the clause introduced by *þȳ lǣs þe* means simply "lest I should commit any sin."

<sup>4</sup> Mätzner (*Englische Grammatik*, 3rd ed., III, 554), who gives this construction more attention than any other writer, goes as far as to say that in Old English *þe* may be substituted for *þonne* after the comparative. But he does not take into account the pronoun, *þon*, which precedes and which is an integral part of this idiom.

<sup>5</sup> For a statement of the doctrine of the shift in meaning of conjunctive elements see my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins), pp. 133 ff.

was happier than he was before and more care-free (in his mind) than before, because of that fair vision.")

*Azarias* 86.—Næfre hlisan āh meotud þon māran, þonne hē wið monna bearn wyrceð weldædum. ("more glory than that: namely, when he performs good deeds.")<sup>6</sup>

*Alfred's Orosius* (ed. *BETS* 79) 100, 16.—Ic sceal ēac þȳ later Rōmāna istōria āsecgan þe ic angunnen hæfde. ("I shall next after that [literally, "later than that"] relate the history of Rome that I had begun.")

*Alfred's Gregory's Pastoral Care* (*BETS* 45) 96, 6.—sē þe oferspræce bið, hē bið nōhte ðon læs mid ðære besmīten, ("He who is a slanderer, he himself is defiled therewith not a bit less than that one [whom he slanders].")

As an illustration of the difficulty offered in the usual interpretation of these so-called instrumental forms (*þon*, *þē*, *þȳ*), see Delbrück's remarks (*Synkretismus* 160) where he struggles with the passage in *Elena* just cited above, line 96. He is uncertain as to what interpretation to put upon *þȳ* and *þē* and makes two suggestions, neither of which is based upon a recognition of the broader aspects of this idiom. He offers to translate the instrumental forms as either "um so" or "dadurch." To translate *þȳ bliðra* and *þē sorglēasra* as "happier and more carefree by that much" gives no meaning to the context because there is no previous measure to be referred to that could serve as the antecedent of measure, and *þȳ* (or *þē*) is useless without an antecedent. Delbrück offers also "dadurch" as an instrumental of means, if the instrumental of measure should not fit. "Happier by that means" is clearly out of the question here, since the phrase, *þurh þā fægeran gesyhd*, covers that aspect of the situation fully and explicitly. Such free conjecturing upon one example does not lead to the basic meaning of the idiom; the matter is again in doubt as soon as the context is changed.

It is apparent that in some examples of this construction we have the comparative formula *in toto* and are not left suspended in mid-air, as is often the case if *þon*, *þȳ*, and *þē* are construed invariably as instrumental of *measure* or *means*. The three forms are recognized in Old English as interchangeable instrumental

<sup>6</sup> The *Sprachschatz* (Grein-Wülker, p. 719) makes this sentence unintelligible by its emendation, *þan*, instead of the ms. reading, *þon*.



forms of the demonstrative pronoun, but the syncretism of cases in West Germanic that brought about that condition has not been explained and it is impossible to distinguish the shade of instrumental meaning in each. The context must be the guide, and many of these occurrences before the comparative, by referring back to a fact or condition previously mentioned as the *basis for comparison*, serve to complete the formula of comparison and are in fact, *instrumentals of comparison*.<sup>7</sup> It is significant to observe at this juncture that Brugmann [*Grundriss* II (2), 542] takes the instrumental as the fundamental case of comparison.

Thus, the Anglo-Saxon felt that the comparative formula was quite complete with only the instrumental *þon* (*þē*, *þȳ*). One is conscious, in reading the many examples of *þon sēl*, *þȳ blīðra*, *þȳ mǣ*, *þȳ lēs*, etc., that these expressions had become stereotyped even in Old English, and that the modern *He is not one whit the better for his experience* is essentially the Old English idiom itself. There is a certain finality about it in Old English that makes it practically a substitute for the regular comparative construction.

If one should ask in these examples, "Better than what?" "Happier than what?" "More than what?" one would find that the idiom invariably points back to some condition or fact previously mentioned or *plainly understood*. In the passage from *Elena* just quoted (96 ff.) the poet has been emphasizing the fear in the mind of Constantine owing to the vast hordes opposed to him in battle. *Cyning wæs āfyrhted, egsan geāclād, . . . hæfde wigena tō lȳt*. (56) Then the poet has Constantine see the vision of the cross in a dream. Upon awaking the king is greatly comforted and the strong contrast with his previous condition is brought out succinctly: *Cyning wæs þȳ blīðra ond þē sorglēasra*. Similarly in *Brunanburh* (43) the circuit of comparison is com-

<sup>7</sup> Behaghel, in his *Modi im Heliand*, 38, remarks that the comparative construction is seldom complete according to the strict grammatical requirements, and cites as anacoluthon: *Heliand* 536,—*so it gio mari ni warth than widor an thesaro weroldi*, and *Heliand* 1515,—*so huie so it ofto duot, so wirōit is simla wirsa, huand hie im gewardon nī mag*. These cases are similar to those under discussion here and illustrate how the basis of comparison may often be implied instead of expressed.

pleted by reference to the condition of *Costontinus* just previously mentioned.

In the passage from *Cura Pastoralis* cited above the basis of comparison is *sē* (*ofersprāce*) and the passage provides proof that *ðon* cannot be the instrumental of measure, because *nōhte* immediately preceding *ðon* is itself the instrumental of measure ("not less by a particle"): there is no possibility of an additional vague measure, "by so much," or "by that much," and *ðon* cannot be forced into that construction. Similarly *Beowulf* 2277,—*ne bið him wihte ðy sēl*, and *Metres of Boethius* (Grein-Wülker), 9, 32,—*micle þē blīðra*, to cite only two more of the many examples of this well known construction, show plainly that the instrumental of the demonstrative pronoun is useless here if forced into a vague sort of *measure* without antecedent.

Although grammarians and translators have generally been satisfied to refer such examples to the instrumental of measure or of means, they have always avoided exact translation, using some such harmless adverb as *much*, or omitting the demonstrative altogether. They have been conscious, perhaps, that *measure* and *means* have no significance in the context, as anyone may see who reads it closely. The full force of this idiom is lost through failure to recognize the instrumental of comparison. The occurrence in the *Saxon Chronicle* 1047 (Laud ms.),—*ond Ulf þ cōm þær tō ond fōr nēah man sceolde tō breccan his stef gif hē ne sealde þē mære gersuman*, brings this out plainly. Shall we say, "He was threatened with removal from office if he did not bestow more gifts *by that*, or *by so much*?" Neither makes sense; the point of the narrative is that the bishop had in the preceding years failed to grant gifts of land and money as generously as he was expected to do, and there was naturally an agitation to have him replaced by another "if he did not bestow more gifts than that": that is, "more gifts than in the past."

Consider also *Alfred's Bede* (ed. Grein) 481, 17,—*ðā wæron hī ðē baldran gewordene* (*solito confidentiores facti*). Miller, *EETS* 95, translates "they were emboldened by this." The Latin *solito* is plainly the ablative of comparison, and we have literally "bolder than what is usual,"—"bolder than usual." The Old English translator uses the comparative, *baldra*, to render the Latin com-

parative, *confidentiores*, showing that he took the Latin literally and not as an intensive expression meaning "uncommonly bold."<sup>8</sup> Miller's translation represents the usual slighting of the demonstrative before the comparative. Modern English *the* could properly be used to render Old English *þon* (*þȳ*, *þē*), though many translators avoid it. I do not use it in the present analysis because, having survived from Old English, it is of course a part of my problem; besides, it is stereotyped in its use before the comparative, and, having its function obscured, would cause confusion.

The syncretism involved in the instrumental case in Germanic is one of the less adequately explained features of the grammar. What functions of the Indo-European instrumental went over into the dative, and exactly what functions survive in the fragmentary remains of the instrumental in Germanic cannot be stated with certainty. The substantive class early merged the instrumental with the dative: *dæge* is both instrumental and dative, and the marking of the instrumental termination *-e* long to distinguish it from the dative, which was begun by Grimm and continued by Grein, is not warranted by the mss. according to Delbrück (*Synkretismus* p. 153). In the strong adjective the instrumental is sometimes given its distinctive form: *gode* beside *godum*,—but the dative form predominates taking over the functions of the instrumental. Of the two Germanic instrumental terminations *-i* and *-u*, Old English preferred *-i* according to Delbrück (*Synkretismus*, p. 164), although there are traces of the other. This instrumental *-i* and the old dative *æ* both became *e* in early Old English. The demonstrative and the interrogative pronouns alone seem to retain distinct instrumental forms. Wright (*Old Engl.*

<sup>8</sup> The Latin comparative ending loses its force in certain locutions even as early as the classical period according to some authorities, and certainly by the Late Latin period. Compare my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins), p. 61; Bennett, *Latin Grammar*, § 240; Wölfflin, *Lateinische und romanische Comparison* 63; Hammesfahr, *Zur Comparison im Altfranzösischen* 4; Knüpfer, *Anfänge periphrastischen Komparation im Englischen*, *Engl. Stud.* 55, 382. Thus, some would read *solito confidentiores* as "uncommonly bold." But in Old English the comparative termination shows no weakening, remaining a strong, conscious mark of gradation down to Modern English. Therefore, since the Anglo-Saxon translator uses the comparative *balðra* there can be no doubt that he takes the Latin construction at its full value.

*Gram.* 2nd ed., p. 235) cites *þon* and *þȳ* as instrumental, merely remarking that they are "difficult to explain satisfactorily." Delbrück (*Synkretismus* 154) gives *þȳ* (*þīs, þȳs*) and *hwȳ* (*hwī*) as the only *fully established* instrumental forms. Others would place OE. *þē* in the category of *true* instrumentals, and even *þon* is often so understood.

It must be said that there is no adequate authority for placing *þon* as *primarily* instrumental. That it came into the dative and the instrumental in certain constructions is very evident, and in such constructions as *þon mā, þon lās, sīþ þon*, we are dealing with Primitive Germanic locutions. Compare Gothic *þanamais, þanaseiþs*; Old Icelandic *en meira*; Old Saxon *than mer, than hluttran*; Old High German *dana halt, dana mer*. Sievers, in the successive editions of his *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 337, takes *þon mā* to mean "mehr als das," thus favoring such a completed formula of comparison as I have indicated above. Sievers, however, does not discuss the difficulty. Dietrich (*Haupts Zeits.* xi, 405) long ago showed that OE. *þon* and *hwon* were probably originally Germanic accusatives (*þana > þone > þon*), and Johansson (*Betz. Beiträge* xvi, 158) considered *þana* of *þanamais, þanaseiþs*, as accusative in form without committing himself as to function. Behaghel (*Zeitformen*, p. 176) attempts to connect *þana* of *þanamais* with the comparative particle, *þanne, danne* by conjecturing that we have here an old ablative ending *-a*: he does not go into an explanation of his view and there seems to be no adequate support for it. The *Sprachschatz* (Grein-Wülker, p. 719) favors a completed comparative construction in such cases, giving the demonstrative, *þon*, the meaning "von da aus gerechnet,—im Vergleich damit"; but it is non-committal as to exact function.

The construction in Old Saxon has been interpreted in exactly the way I advocate for English. Examples are:—

*Heliland* 536,—so it gio mari ni warth *than widor* an thesaro weroldi.

*Heliland* 974,—that he ni spraki thero wordo *than mer*.

*Heliland* 2127,—the gelobon habdi *than hluttran* te himile.

Behaghel (*Syntax im Heliland* 125) remarks that the demonstrative *than* in such cases "auf die verglichene Grösse zurückweist." That is to say, it refers back to some object or magnitude with which comparison is to be made. If the previous magnitude or

condition is well understood as being set up as a standard of comparison, then the construction cannot mean "greater, or more, *by that much*" (instr. of measure) nor can it mean "greater, or broader, *through that, by means of that*" (instr. of means). It can be interpreted only as meaning "greater, or broader, or louder, *than that or than before*." We have in this construction, as Behaghel's analysis indicates, the completed formula of comparison. See the Introduction to my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins, 1924) for the basic meaning of comparison.

In the syncretism that produced such a variety of forms in the instrumental case of the demonstrative pronoun in Old English (*þȳ, þē, þē, þon*) there was also a running together of functions and a leveling out, so that these various forms, having originally different functions and different meanings, became interchangeable. It is not to be assumed, of course, that *all* occurrences of *þon, þȳ, þē* are to be interpreted in the light of the idiom under discussion, but I take the position that in many examples of demonstrative pronoun plus comparative in Old English we must recognize an *instrumental of comparison*, functioning in the same way as the regular dative of comparison. (Latin, ablative; Greek, genitive; Sanskrit, ablative and instrumental.) We may, perhaps, go as far as to say that in the complex syncretism of forms associated with the instrumental case in Germanic, there was a survival of an Indo-European instrumental of comparison.<sup>9</sup>

Let us glance at this instrumental of the demonstrative pronoun in Modern English. It precedes the comparative just as it did in Old English, and in my opinion this use of Modern English *the* is still a clear example of the instrumental of comparison.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Compare Brugmann, *Grundriss* II (2), 542; *Indogerman. Forschungen* 27, 159; Speyer, *Vedische und Skt. Syntax*, p. 12; and Pischel, *Götting. gel. Anzeiger* 1884 (13), 512, for the well established instrumental of comparison in Sanskrit, Lithuanian, and Irish. Brugmann considers it the fundamental case of comparison in Indo-European. For the instrumental of comparison in Old High German and in Old Saxon, see respectively Delbrück, *Synkretismus*, p. 200, and Behagel, *Syntax im Heliand*, 128.

<sup>10</sup> The construction under discussion at this point should be distinguished from at least two others in Modern English in which *the* precedes the comparative. In "He is *the* happier of the two," the word, *the*, is simply the definite article. In "*The* more, *the* merrier," the word *the* is the instru-

1. This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* the better for (on account of) his constant practice.
2. His marksmanship is not *any* the better for his constant practice.

In these sentences *a great deal* and *any* are clearly instrumental of measure and the phrase, *for his constant practice*, is in both sentences the instrumental of means. The object of comparison is the former condition of the soldier in question. Let us now express the object of comparison by a clause.

3. This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* better than that of his comrades on account of his constant practice.
4. His marksmanship is not *any* better than that of his comrades in spite of his constant practice.

In these two sentences we are not referred back to the soldier's previous condition for the object of comparison; we look forward to the "than" clause. We still have the instrumental of measure and of means expressed as in the first two sentences, but to retain the word, *the*, before the comparative when the clause of comparison is expressed, as in 3 and 4, is absolutely impossible in English syntax.

If, as is commonly held by the authorities, the pronoun, *the*, be merely a vague instrumental of measure or of means without antecedent (at first meaning "by so much," then becoming a general intensive), why can it not be used in a sentence of the second type (3 and 4)? The truth is that this demonstrative pronoun before the comparative takes the place of the clause of comparison, referring back to a previous condition or fact just expressed or plainly understood, and is to be interpreted literally, "than that." Whenever the comparison is not made with a former condition, or with a fact just previously stated, the instrumental of comparison, *the*, is not needed and cannot be used. Sentence 1 means, then, "This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* better than that (than it

mental of measure, and the meaning is "By whatever amount more, by that amount is it merrier." But the construction I am studying may be illustrated by the sentence, "He labored hard in his youth, and now he is *a great deal the* healthier for it." The word *the* is here considered by all the authorities to be the instrumental of measure or of means. If my conclusions are correct, however, *the* is the instrumental of comparison. The word, *deal*, is the instrumental of measure, and the word, *it*, is the instrumental of means.

was) on account of his constant practice"; and similarly in example 2 the reference is to a former condition. I have never seen an example of this construction in any period of English in which this did not hold true.<sup>11</sup>

Beginning, then, with a Primitive Germanic construction, which may be posited on the strength of Gothic *þanamais*, *þanaseiþs*, Old Icelandic *þa en meira*, Old English *þon* (*þan*) *mā*, etc., Old High German *dana mer*, *dana halt*, Old Saxon *than mer*, *than hluttran*, and coming down to present-day English, we find that the demonstrative pronoun in our idiom had reference to a fact or condition with which comparison was to be made and was in function an instrumental of comparison. At first referring to a definite antecedent it gradually became stereotyped, either having a definitely expressed antecedent or pointing back to a condition plainly implied.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The *NED* under *the* (demonstrative pronoun) in attempting to explain this construction attributes almost every *instrumental* function to *the* excepting comparison, but fails to make function and meaning agree in this little word. It ends by assuming a hypothetical development in the idiom to account for its present "pleonastic" form. To quote: "The radical meaning is 'in or by that,' 'in or by so much,' e. g. 'if you sow them now, they will come up the sooner'; 'he has a holiday, and looks the better,' to which the pleonastic 'for it' has been added, and the sentence at length turned into 'he looks the better for his holiday.'" Such a theory may easily be refuted by pointing to the construction in line 96 of the *Elena*, cited above. The phrase, *þurh þa fægeran gesyhl*, functions as the instrumental of means corresponding to the phrase "for it" (i. e. "through it") of the examples in *NED*. If there be any pleonasm, it has existed from the very beginning; for this is one idiom in Modern English that has persisted from our earliest records without a particle of change either in function or in meaning. There is no pleonasm, however, since the demonstrative refers to a former condition or magnitude as the basis of comparison, and the means ("through, or by, or for something") and measure (*micke*, *nohte*, "by far," "a whit," "somewhat") are properly added to shade off the comparison.

<sup>12</sup> The finality of the construction is nowhere more markedly shown than in our present-day use where one feels that the demonstrative, *the*, completes the circuit of comparison perfectly, without holding in suspense some unexpressed clause of comparison. In the sentence, "He is a great deal stronger" one must mentally supply the clause "than he was." If one says, however, "He is a great deal the stronger," the circuit is somehow felt to be complete and no clause can be supplied, mentally or

## III

If we now return to the full idiom, *þon mā þe*, etc., which was set forth in its various forms at the beginning of this article, we shall find that we are prepared to interpret the particle *þe* that follows the comparative.

The few grammarians who have noticed this idiom at all (mentioned above) have tried in one way or another to connect it with the comparative particle, *than*, because like *than* it serves to introduce the clause of comparison.

*Daniel* 264,—*næs him se swæg to sorge ðon mā ðe sunnan scīma.*

*Metres of Boethius* 28, 36,—*ne bið hīo on æfen nē on ærmorgen mere-strēame þē nēar þe on midne dæg.*

Taking *þon* (*þū*, *þē*) as the instrumental of measure or of means before the comparative, which is usually insisted upon, one is forced to read into the following *þe* all the meaning and function of the regular comparative particle, *þonne*. There is no evidence to show that *þe* is a writing for *þonne* in Old English, nor can scribal errors account for so many occurrences over so long a period. The particle, *þe*, is clearly the ordinary relative particle, and it is not necessary to give it the meaning of the comparative particle, *þonne*, which must be done if the preceding demonstrative pronoun, *þon* (*þū*, *þē*), is to be taken as instrumental of measure or means: *Daniel* 264,—“To them the roaring flame was not *any* (*a whit*) *more harmful than* sunshine (is).”

Since, however, the circuit of comparison is grammatically complete in the demonstrative pronoun plus the comparative, as I have demonstrated in the preceding section, we may take the following particle, *þe*, in one of its established functions of introducing substantive clauses. This, in my opinion, gives the true syntactical analysis of our idiom and reveals the basic meaning: *Daniel* 264,—“To them the roaring flame was no more harmful *than this* (*næs þon mā*), namely, (*þe*) sunshine,” or, “than this, namely, what sunshine is.” *Metres of Boethius* 28, 36,—“Neither in the even-

otherwise. This is, of course, no scientific argument in favor of my position; but the feeling to-day that no clause of comparison can follow the comparative if the demonstrative, *the*, precedes clinches the conclusions I have drawn from historical grammar.



ing nor at dawn is it (the sun) nearer to the sea than this ( $\beta\bar{e}$  *nēar*), namely, ( $\beta e$ ) its distance at noon," or, "what it is at noon." Thus, the demonstrative pronoun and the relative particle,  $\beta on$  . . .  $\beta e$ ,  $\beta\bar{y}$  . . .  $\beta e$ , or  $\beta\bar{e}$  . . .  $\beta e$ , are together equivalent to the comparative particle, *than* ( $\beta onne$ ); however, the function of comparison lies not in the relative particle<sup>13</sup> but in the preceding demonstrative pronoun,  $\beta on$  ( $\beta\bar{y}$ ,  $\beta\bar{e}$ ), functioning as an instrumental of comparison.

GEORGE WILLIAM SMALL.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

### A CHAUCERIAN ECHO IN SPENSER

Upton<sup>1</sup> long ago suggested that Spenser, in his famous description of the House of Pride (*Faerie Queene*, I, iv), may have had in mind Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*. In that case, it would be reasonable to suppose that he might transfer from it a definite picture.

We recall that, as the "glitterand" *Lucifera* sits in state upon her throne, the people "thronging in the hall, Doe ride each other upon her to gaze." Similarly, Chaucer's people "in a corner of the halle . . . clamben up on othere faste" in order to behold the mysterious stranger whose identity, it is hoped, will forever lie in the dark backward and abysm of time. The two descriptions are as follows:

#### THE HOUS OF FAME.

I herde a gret noise withalle  
In a corner of the halle,

. . . . .

<sup>13</sup> This peculiar function of the particle,  $\beta e$ , in converting a demonstrative pronoun or demonstrative adverb into something like a relative conjunction [in this case giving to the demonstrative,  $\beta on$  ( $\beta\bar{y}$ ,  $\beta\bar{e}$ ), the relative force of the subordinate conjunction of comparison, *than*] is one of the formative processes in the development of subordinate conjunctions in English. For a full treatment of this subject with bibliography, see Appendix B of my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins, 1924), especially pp. 148 ff.

<sup>1</sup> *The Faerie Queene*, London, 1753, II, 367.

And whan they were alle on an hepe,  
 Tho behinde gonne up lepe,  
 And clamben up on othere faste.<sup>2</sup>

#### THE HOUSE OF PRIDE.

The heapes of people, thronging in the hall,  
 Doe ride each other upon her to gaze.<sup>3</sup>

As for the word *heapes*, H. M. Percival<sup>4</sup> glosses in this way:

'Crowd'; this use of the word, lately revived as a colloquialism, is old: *Piers Plowman*, Prol. 53, "Heremites on an heep . . . wenten to Walsyng-ham"; V, 233, "An hep of chapmen"; and is the common meaning of Germ. *haufen*.

Its use in the above passage, however, may have been due to Chaucer's "on an hepe" in a parallel context.<sup>5</sup>

ROBERT R. CAWLEY.

Princeton University.

#### THE "LUCY" POEMS

The poems of Wordsworth usually grouped as the "Lucy" poems are: *Strange fits of passion have I known; She dwelt among the untrodden ways; I travelled among unknown men; Three years she grew in sun and shower; and A slumber did my spirit seal. Lucy Gray* should, I think, be included as the basis for the others. Thus considered, a plausible solution of the question of Lucy's identity, which has troubled readers for more than a hundred years, suggests itself.

<sup>2</sup> Skeat's *Student's Chaucer*, 2141-51.

<sup>3</sup> *Faerie Queene*, I, iv, 16, 7-8.

<sup>4</sup> *The Faerie Queene, Book I*, London and New York, 1893, p. 219.

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting that the poet uses *heaped* in a similar description which has been compared with *The Squeres Tale*, 189 ff.:

(I, xii, 9, 1-3) "And after all the raskall many ran,  
*Heaped* together in rude rabblement,  
 To see the face of that victorious man."

And in two other places (IV, iii, 41, 4; V, v, 5, 8), nearly the only ones where he uses *heapes* specifically in the sense of *crowds of people*, the picture is that of men pushing eagerly forward to catch a glimpse of some famous person.

Can it be shown that the actual event which originated *Lucy Gray*, suggested also the others, and that they are all of one cloth? The poet's note to *Lucy Gray* reads:

Written at Goslar in Germany. It was founded on a circumstance told me by my sister, of a little girl, who, not far from Halifax in Yorkshire, was bewildered in a snow-storm. Her foot-steps were traced by her parents to the middle of the lock of a canal, and no other vestige of her, backward or forward, could be traced. The body however was found in the canal.

*Lucy Gray* was written at approximately the same time and place as the five usually known as the "Lucy" poems. My idea is that the poet, being deeply impressed with this happening, wrote not only the poem *Lucy Gray*, but a series of poems dealing with Lucy at different ages, all having in common the thought of her untimely death.

With this idea in mind, let us examine the poems. In *Lucy Gray*, Lucy is a child of unknown age, a "little girl." The incident is related nearly as it was told to Wordsworth by his sister. In the other poems, the five "Lucy" poems, Lucy has grown to womanhood. She has a lover. In one, the lover fears that she will die; in the other four, he laments her death. "The springs of Dove"<sup>1</sup> are in Yorkshire. Wordsworth's note to *Lucy Gray* shows that the incident which occasioned that poem took place in Yorkshire. The real connection between the incident of *Lucy Gray* and the writing of the five others is the common theme of the death of the heroine.

In regard to *Lucy Gray*, Dowden observes that, "The chief departure from the real incident is that Lucy Gray's body is not found; this gives opportunity for the rumors that she is still alive, and the supposed confirmation of these rumors by her apparition on the wild."<sup>2</sup> This slight change in the incident not only adds charm to the poem, but may have some bearing on Wordsworth's renewal of the incident in still different forms in the "Lucy" group.

The poem, *Three years she grew in sun and shower* is the story

<sup>1</sup> *She dwelt among the untrodden ways*, line 2.

<sup>2</sup> Dowden, Edward, ed., *Poems by Wordsworth*, note on *Lucy Gray*, p. 375.

of how Lucy, with nature as guide, grows to womanhood. It is in this poem that nature says:

This child I to myself will take;  
She shall be mine, and I will make  
A lady of my own.

So nature completes her education, being both "law and impulse";

And vital feelings of delight  
Shall rear her form to stately height  
Her virgin bosom swell;  
Such thoughts to Lucy I will give  
While she and I together live  
Here in this happy dell.  
Thus Nature spake—the work was done.

The work was done. Nature had made a lady of the little girl. There is nothing in the remaining four poems of the group incompatible with the age attained in this poem.

To sum up, then, the Lucy of the "Lucy" poems is none other than the Lucy of *Lucy Gray*. These poems have their basis in fact, an incident related to Wordsworth by his sister. The incident has been colored by the imagination of the poet, and a series of poems, having the heroine at different ages, has been produced. This method of taking an incident from real life and coloring it with imagination is the one commonly followed by Wordsworth. We have no reason to suppose that he departed from his custom in this instance. The original poem is *Lucy Gray*. The "Lucy" group of five has a theme in common, the untimely death of the girl and the lamentation of her lover. There is no hidden, mysterious person to seek. All the scenes are in England. All the internal evidence of the poems points to the home of the heroine of *Lucy Gray* as the scene of the group.

WALTER PENNINGTON.

*Northwestern University.*

---

## A NOTE ON 'CORONES TWO'

In two articles written several years ago (*PMLA*. 26, 315 ff. and 29, 129 ff.), Professor Lowes explained the symbolism of the 'corones two' of Chaucer's *Second Nun's Tale* and cited illustrations of the widespread use of this symbolism. Another illustration is to be found in a stanzaic version of the *Life of St. Anne*, an edition of which I have in process of preparation, contained in the University of Minnesota ms. Z. 822, N. 81 (formerly Philipps ms. 8122).

The Virgin Mary, who has been brought up in the temple, has reached the age of twelve years and has been told by the council of bishops that she should now marry. But she refuses marriage and explains her refusal as follows:

Scho answerde hym þan full myldly  
 & sayd: *seruay* here ensempyll why,  
 Als 3e may wrytyn se.  
 Abell, þat cursyd kayn slogh,  
 Lyfs now in heuen wit yoy enoght;  
 And two corones haues he.  
 One had he for hys martyrdom,  
 Another he had hym best becom  
 Ffor hys vergynte.  
 And Ely ravyt to heuen es  
 For he keped hym in clenness:  
 Swylk grace may god send me.

(ll. 445-456)

This manuscript was written about the time of Chaucer's death, but the poem narrating the *Life of St. Anne* is a copy of an older original. The source of this poem, it should be added, and probably the source of the whole medieval conception of the symbolism of the two crowns of martyrdom and virginity, is the apocryphal *Pseudo-Matthæi Evangelium*, Cap. VII:

Tunc Abiathar obtulit munera infinita pontificibus, ut acciperet eam filio suo tradendam uxorem. Prohibebat autem Maria dicens: Non potest fieri ut ego virum cognoscam aut me vir cognoscat. Pontifices autem et omnes eius affines dicebant ei: Deus in filiis colitur et in posteris adoratur, sicut semper fuit in Israel. Respondens autem Maria dixit illis: Deus in castitate primo omnium colitur, ut comprobatur. Nam ante Abel nullus

fuit iustus inter homines, et iste pro oblatione placuit deo, et ab eo qui displicuit inclementer occisus est. Duas tamen coronas accepit, oblationis et virginitatis, quia in carne sua nunquam pollutionem admisit. Denique et Helias cum esset in carne assumptus est, quia carnem suam virginem custodivit. Haec ego didici in templo dei ab infantia mea, quod deo cara esse possit virgo. Ideo hoc statui in corde meo ut vinum penitus non cognoscam.

(Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 65)

ROSCOE E. PARKER.

*University of California.*

### TINTINNABULATION

At page 281 in *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, Professor Campbell has the following note:

Perhaps a coinage of Poe's out of Latin *tintinnabulum*; no earlier example of its use is recorded by either the *Oxford Dictionary* or the *Century Dictionary*. Whitty (p. 233) quotes a passage from Poulson's *Daily Advertiser* concerning bells (found, so he states, among the clippings in an old "Marginalia" book kept by Poe) in which the word *Tintin-nabula* appears.

If Poe ever read any of the editions of John Hookham Frere's *Monks and Giants*, as Byron did, he might well have noted the following from the first edition of 1817. Canto III:

With tintinnabular uproar were astounded, (Stanza xvii.)

Tunc in triumpho fracto tintinnabulo, (xxv.)

Et fregit tintinnabulum lapide jacto, (xxvi.)

Himself an anti-tintinnabularian, (xxx.)

Thronged in the hallow tintinnabularian hive, (xlii.)

As for the sources cited by Professor Campbell (pp. 280-281), it seems safe to say that the three Latin stanzas "transcribed" by Frere from "An ancient monkish record" contain quite as much or quite as little to inspire the genius of Poe.

C. B. COOPER.

*Armour Institute of Technology.*

## ANOTHER FORGOTTEN NOVEL

In the early eighties, John Hay, Republican, wrote a novel, fourth rate at best—a thesis novel called *The Breadwinners*,<sup>1</sup> in which he defended capital. This novel he was moved to write by the riots of 1877, the climax year of the Northern Pacific Panic. It is mentioned by the better historians of American Literature, and sometimes placed on reserve in college libraries. But that is just half the tale. The other half, for reasons it is not impossible to discover, has remained generally unknown.

There was an answer to *The Breadwinners*—*The Money-Makers*<sup>2</sup> by Henry F. Keenan—which, although it is unquestionably better than *The Breadwinners*, has been overlooked. One looks in vain for the title in DuBreuil,<sup>3</sup> Van Doren,<sup>4</sup> Speare,<sup>5</sup> Pattee,<sup>6</sup> and the *Cambridge History*.<sup>7</sup> One looks in vain also in the magazine indexes and in the index of the New York *Tribune*. Of the biographers of Hay, Mr. Sears<sup>8</sup> says nothing about it and Mr. Thayer<sup>9</sup> dismisses it with the brief comment that it “achieved notoriety.” Only one man, so far as I can discover—Mr. William Montgomery Clemens, editor of the *Biblio*—has given it anything like the consideration it deserves.<sup>10</sup>

The principal reason *The Money-Makers* has remained in obscurity seems to be that John Hay suppressed it. The character of

<sup>1</sup> Published anonymously by Harper, New York, 1883.

<sup>2</sup> Published anonymously by D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1885.

<sup>3</sup> *The Novel in Democracy in America*, by Alice Jouveau DuBreuil, J. H. Furst Co., Baltimore, 1923.

<sup>4</sup> *The American Novel*, by Carl Van Doren, Macmillan, New York, 1921.

<sup>5</sup> *The Political Novel, Its Development in England and in America*, by Morris E. Speare, Oxford University Press, New York, 1924.

<sup>6</sup> *A History of American Literature since 1870*, by Fred Lewis Pattee, Century Co., New York, 1921.

<sup>7</sup> *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, Putnam, New York, 1921.

<sup>8</sup> *John Hay, Author and Statesman*, by Lorenzo Sears, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, 1914.

<sup>9</sup> *The Life and Letters of John Hay*, by William Roscoe Thayer, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1915.

<sup>10</sup> *How John Hay Suppressed a First Edition*, by Rodney Blake (pseudonym), in the *Biblio*, Pompton Lakes, N. J., Vol. 1, Oct. 21, pp. 77-79.

Aaron Grimstone, the money-king, was modeled after Hay's father-in-law, Amasa Stone.<sup>11</sup> Grimstone, like Stone, commits suicide in his bathroom—and for the same reason as Stone. In the first edition of *The Money-Makers* occurs the following passage:<sup>12</sup> “On the marble stand beside the bath the pamphlet edition of the finding of the jury in the Academy disaster was lying open at the page where Aaron Grimstone's name appeared as responsible for the lives lost.” And in the New York *Herald* account of Stone's suicide occurs the following:<sup>13</sup> “The Ashtabula bridge which fell some time ago, causing the death of many persons, was one of his pet structures, and its loss caused him great worry. He had constant fear that he would be made legally responsible for the great loss of life occasioned by that disaster.” There are other similarities—the most obvious one being the bluntness of both in conversation. And there is reason to believe—and this Mr. Clemens has not pointed out—that not only was Grimstone modeled after Stone, but Hilliard after John Hay himself. Like Hay, Archie Hilliard was secretary to a high official in Washington, and later a legate and editor. Like Hay's, his entrance into journalism was the result of an accident. In fact, the very year of his entrance into journalism was the same as that of Hay's.

Upon the appearance of *The Money-Makers* John Hay “hastened to New York by the fastest train available, saw the Appleton's, caused the first edition . . . to be suppressed, bought up every copy on sale in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, recalled hundreds of volumes from booksellers in other cities, and in every possible way placed *The Money-Makers* beyond the ken of the public eye.” Later in the same year there appeared in the *Magazine of Western History*<sup>14</sup> a eulogistic article on Amasa Stone, signed J. H., in which Stone's suicide is attributed to insomnia and his bluntness (Keenan accounts for Grimstone's by the dehumanizing influence of his life) to his honesty. The suppression, so far at least as the present generation is concerned, seems to have been effective. Another edition was printed in 1886, but it seems not to have been noticed by the reviewers—a fact which, in view of Mr. Thayer's

<sup>11</sup> *How John Hay Suppressed a First Edition.*

<sup>12</sup> P. 336.

<sup>13</sup> May 11, 1883.

<sup>14</sup> Vol. 3, Dec., 1885, p. 108.



statement that the novel "achieved notoriety," is rather significant. The magazines had much to say about *The Breadwinners*; some of the reviewers mentioned it in spite of the fact that they didn't consider it very good, merely because it had created a sensation. They were more interested, apparently, in polemics defending capital than in those defending labor.

The question arises, of course, how far Grimstone and Hilliard are true representations of Stone and Hay—whether Stone was really such a hardened money-getter and Hay such a moral weakling as the novel would lead one to believe. Probably not, although certainly the book is not virulent or fanatical. In any case, *The Money-Makers* unquestionably deserves a place in any treatment of the American thesis novel. It belongs in the group of realistic studies, and ranks well among novels of its decade in characterization, style, plot, and development of thesis. The men and women in it are not personifications, but persons, and are treated with some degree of subtlety. The workers are not idealized; the money-getters are not wholly contemptible, and the worst of them are objects of pity rather than hatred. The immoral Beauxjambes is nevertheless capable of loving, and the intriguing Madame Domiguez is capable of gratitude. The parasite Hilliard is weak, but not vicious. Grimstone himself is to the last an affectionate father, and in his worst characteristics is the helpless victim of his own past. He is an excellent character, almost worthy of comparison to Dryfoos in Howells' *A Hazard of New Fortunes*.<sup>15</sup>

*The Money-Makers* has, it is true, its defects. For one thing, its treatment of the working class is superficial; Keenan did not understand them as well as Upton Sinclair. But if his knowledge was inadequate, he at least had the good sense to display it only when necessary. His novel is, for the most part, a study of the effects of the money philosophy upon the upper stratum. In this, and also in its treatment of journalism, it may be compared again to *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. It has a plot which is a thing in itself, and not merely a thread upon which to hang criticism and theories. And withal, the plot does not obscure the thesis; the two

<sup>15</sup> Harper, New York, 1891. Silas Lapham, of course, is not quite the same type.

are very closely correlated, and developed to a strong climax. Keenan, moreover, like Howells, although he did include some Democratic propaganda, had the wisdom to leave his problem unsolved. One the whole, *The Money-Makers* is probably the best novel of its particular type up to 1891; in some respects it is even superior to *A Hazard of New Fortunes*—it is not so long-winded, and much more virile. It is, as American novels of the eighties go, an artistic novel; and as a social study it is slightly more convincing than a text-book in sociology.

CLIFFORD A. BENDER.

*University of Minnesota.*

### MILTON'S POPULARITY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

In view of the statement "Few read Milton now, unless under academic compulsion,"<sup>1</sup> it is interesting to recall the following passage from Carl Philip Moritz' *Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahr 1782*:<sup>2</sup>

Die Englischen Nationalschriften lieszt das Volk, wie unter anderen die unzähligen Auflagen beweisen. Meine Wirthinn, die nur eine Schneiderwittwe ist, lieszt ihren Milton, und erzählt mir, dasz ihr verstorbner Mann, sie eben wegen der guten Deklamation, womit sie den Milton las, zuerst liebgewonnen habe. Dieser einzelne Fall würde nichts beweisen, allein ich habe schon mehrere Leute von geringerm Stande gesprochen, die all ihre Nationalschriftsteller kannten und theils gelesen hatten.

ALFRED E. RICHARDS.

*University of New Hampshire.*

<sup>1</sup> Osgood, *New York Evening Post* (Literary Supplement), June 16, 1923, p. 764.

<sup>2</sup> *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, No. 126, Dritte Folge, No. 6.

## TWO NOTES ON SPENSER'S CLASSICAL SOURCES

## I. SPENSER AND APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

In a previous article I have called attention to the influence of Apollonius Rhodius on Spenser's conception of the goddess of nature in *Mutabilitie*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Argonautica* is another passage which appears to be the source of one of the most brilliant passages in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*. The matter is more significant than the ordinary case of literary relationship, because it has to do with Spenser's recognition of the great importance of sea-power to the development of the greater Britain, and his sympathy with Raleigh's ambition to be instrumental in the carrying out of the imperial policy.

After the conversation between Colin and the "straunge shepheard" that day by Mulla's shore, and the contest in which Colin sings of the loves of Bregog and Mulla and the Shepherd of the Ocean sings of Cynthia, the Lady of the Sea, the two friends go to the ship that is to carry them across the perilous seas to find that shepherdess. Colin is appalled by the vastness of the realm in which nought but sea and heaven appeared. He asks the Shepherd of the Ocean to tell him under what sky or in what world they are, in which appear to be no living people. This realm, his friend tells him, is

The regiment

Of a great shepheardesse, that Cynthia hight,  
His liege, his ladie, and his lifes regent.  
"If then," quoth I, "a shepheardesse she bee,  
Where be the flockes and heards, which she doth keep?  
And where may I the hills and pastures see,  
On which she useth for to feed her sheepe?"  
"These be the hills," quoth he, "the surges hie,  
On which faire Cynthia her heards doth feed:  
Her heards be thousand fishes, with their frie,  
Which in the bosome of the billowes breed."

When the shepherd summons them, he continues, "they all for their relief Wend too and fro at evening and at morn"; Proteus drives his herd of seals, compelling them which way he list:

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Philology*, xx, 234.

"And I among the rest, of many least,  
Have in the ocean charge to me assignd:  
Where I will live or die at her behest."

The figure is carried still further by the statement that a hundred nymphs of heavenly race have charge of the washing of Cynthia's sheep. So all these are

"the shepherds which my Cynthia serve  
At sea, beside a thousand moe at land:  
For land and sea my Cynthia doth deserve  
To have at her commandement at hand."

This passage is a free rendering of *Argon.* I, 570 ff. in which we are told that when the expedition set sail Orpheus sang:

Of Artemis, saviour of ships, child of a glorious sire, who hath in her keeping those peaks by the sea . . . and the fishes came darting through the deep sea, great mixed with small, and followed gambolling along the watery paths. And as when in the track of a shepherd their master, countless sheep follow to the fold that have fed to the full of grass, and he goes before gaily piping a shepherd's strain on his shrill reed, so these fishes followed, and a chasing breeze ever bore the ship onward.<sup>2</sup>

It will be noted that Artemis is identified by Spenser with Cynthia (Elizabeth), and that the comparison between the ship followed by fishes and the shepherd with his sheep suggests not only Elizabeth's dominion over the sea but the poet's happy epithet for Raleigh as "the Shepherd of the Ocean." To this we may now add what may have been dimly present in the poet's consciousness, that this journey of Raleigh and Spenser was a new expedition of the Argonauts. In the mind of one were the great plans for making England a maritime power; in the mind of the other the conception, partially worked out in the manuscript which he bore with him, of the poem which was to celebrate this new imperial Britain.

## II. SPENSER AND HESIOD

That Spenser was acquainted with Hesiod has been shown by a number of references cited since the time of Upton. The most important of the debts, however, seems to have escaped notice. The debate between Braggadocchio and Belpheobe in *Faerie Queene* II, III, 38 ff. has some resemblances to the passage in *Comus* in

<sup>2</sup> Tr. Seaton, Loeb edn., *Apoll. Rhod. Argon.*

which the Lady rebukes the enchanter, and belongs to a distinguished literary tradition. One stanza in Spenser's splendid version of it leads us directly to Hesiod. The stanza (41) is as follows:

In woods, in waves, in warres, she wonts to dwell,  
And wil be found with perill and with paine;  
Ne can the man that moulds in ydle cell  
Unto her happy mansion attaine:  
Before her gate high God did Sweate ordaine,  
And wakefull watches ever to abide;  
But easy is the way and passage plaine  
To pleasures pallace: it may soone be spide,  
And day and night her dores to all stand open wide.

This passage about the way to honor is imitated from *Works and Days* I, 287-292. A little later, Hesiod's version appealed to another Elizabethan poet, George Chapman, and in order to show the parallel I quote his translation:

With much ease  
To Vice and her love, men may make access;  
Such crews in rout herd to her, and her court  
So passing near lies, their way sweet and short;  
But before Virtue do the Gods rain sweat,  
Through which, with toil and half-dissolved feet,  
You must wade to her; her path long and steep,  
And at your entry 'tis so sharp and deep.  
But scaling once her height, the joy is more  
Than all the pain she put you to before.

Chapman's note on the passage emphasizes it as an expression of the conflict through which the soul fights through the knowledge and hate of the miseries and beastliness of vice:

His argument to persuade to virtue here is taken both from her own natural fate and the divine disposition of God; for as she hath a body, being supposed the virtue of man, and through the worthily exercised and instructed organs of that body, her soul receives her excitation to all her expressible knowledge (for *dati sunt sensus ad excitandum intellectum*), so to the love and habit of knowledge and virtue there is first necessarily required a laborious and painful conflict, fought through the knowledge and hate of the miseries and beastliness of vice. And this painful passage to Virtue Virgil imitated in his translation of the Pythagorean letter Y.

Chapman's note indicates precisely the exposition of the virtue

of Temperance which is the subject of Spenser's Legend of Guyon; the allegory of the soul and the body, and of the place of knowledge and of the intellectual love of God, of which Chapman speaks, are implicit throughout the book. As to the "Pythagorean letter Y," ascribed to Virgil in Spenser's and Chapman's time, we have Chapman's translation, as follows:

This letter of Pythagoras, that bears  
 This fork'd distinction, to conceit prefers  
 The form man's life bears. Virtue's hard way takes  
 Upon the right hand path, which entry makes  
 (To sensual eyes) with difficult affair;  
 But when ye once have climb'd the highest stair,  
 The beauty and the sweetness it contains,  
 Give rest and comfort, for past all your pains.  
 The broadway in a bravery paints ye forth,  
 (In th' entry) softness, and much shade of worth;  
 But when ye reach the top, the taken ones  
 It headlong hurls down, torn at sharpest stones.  
 He then, whom virtues love, shall victor crown  
 Of hardest fortunes, praise wins and renown;  
 But he that sloth and fruitless luxury  
 Pursues, and doth with foolish wariness fly  
 Opposed pains (that all best acts befall),  
 Lives poor and vile, and dies despised of all.<sup>3</sup>

EDWIN GREENLAW.

---

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Professor W. P. Mustard for a reference to Persius  
*Sat.* III:

et tibi quae Samios diduxit littera ramos  
 surgentem dextro monstravit limite callem.

Professor Gildersleeve's note on this passage explains that the letter Y, "or rather its old form Y, was selected by Pythagoras to embody the immemorial image of the two paths (Hesiod, *O. et D.*, 287-292), so familiar in the apologue of Hercules at the cross-roads (Xen., *Comm.*, 2, 1, 20), and alluded to again by our author, 5, 34. Hence this letter was called the Pythagorean; Auson., 12, *de litt. monos.*, 9." Gildersleeve also cites Conington's explanation of the symbolism of the letter: "The stem stands for the unconscious life of infancy and childhood, the diverging branches for the alternative offered to the youth, virtue or vice."

## A HANDFUL OF PLEASANT DELIGHTS

When my *Handful of Pleasant Delights* (1584) was published by the Harvard University Press in January, 1924, I devoted considerable space to arguing that the first Elizabethan edition was actually printed in 1566, the year in which it was registered at Stationers' Hall for publication. Since that time my arguments, which were generally approved, have received totally unexpected confirmation in the discovery of a fragment of what may have been the 1566 edition, and of what, in any case, was certainly an edition earlier than that of 1584.

This fragment (which is totally different from the other fragment of one leaf printed on pages 74-75 of my book) was sold at Sotheby and Company's, London, on July 27, 1925, for £160. It was bought by the Rosenbach Company, of New York and Philadelphia, from whose hands it passed into the Huntington Library. Through the kindness of Mr. Huntington's librarian, some time ago I was permitted to examine photographs of the fragment, which consists of four leaves corresponding exactly to signatures D2-D3, D6-D7, of the *Handful* of 1584 and to pages 51-54, 59-62, of my edition of 1924.

In the near future I hope to incorporate these leaves in a new edition of my book. Meanwhile, it is interesting to know that the *Handful* went through three Elizabethan editions—not one, as was believed for many years,—thus surpassing in popularity both the *Gorgeous Gallery* of 1578 and the *Phoenix Nest* of 1593, neither of which, so far as is known, reached a second edition.

HYDER E. ROLLINS.

New York University.

## A NOTE ON PEREGRINE PICKLE AND PYGMALION

Professor Tatlock wrote a letter, printed in *The Nation*, Feb. 18, 1915, pointing out the similarity between the plot of Shaw's *Pygmalion* and the incident of the "nymph of the road" in the eighty-seventh chapter of Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*. In this letter he suggested what has occurred to many readers of Shaw and

Smollett: that the modern playwright used the eighteenth century novelist as a source. The following brief summaries will show how naturally such an idea would occur to one familiar with both works.

*Peregrine Pickle*

Peregrine meets by chance with a buxom beggar-lass whose mother is only too glad to get rid of her for a small sum. The girl is sent ahead to the "garrison," under Pipes' custody, to be cleansed and re-clad. Peregrine is so much impressed by the "nymph's" altered appearance that he decides to hoax society by passing her off as a young lady of rank and breeding. He spends some days in schooling her in deportment and proper enunciation, teaches her quotations from Shakespeare, Otway, and Pope, as well as some operatic airs to be hummed during pauses in conversation, and above all, instructs her in whist, brag, and cribbage. After a preliminary introduction to provincial society, in which his protégée fairly dazzles the squires, he takes her to London, where he continues her education in French and dancing, and squires her to plays and concerts. When all is ready, he conducts her to a public assembly, dances with her to the admiration of all present, and succeeds in introducing her to various ladies of quality. Thus his trick has triumphed. At a subsequent card-party, however, the girl grows furious at discovering a certain lady in the act of cheating: wrath strips off the thin veneer of culture, and she horrifies the company by her language and attitudes. Immediately afterwards, she elopes with Peregrine's Swiss valet, and the hero, though at first angry, relents to the extent of assisting the couple to set up a coffee-house which proves financially successful.

*Pygmalion*

Henry Higgins, a professional phonetician, wagers with his friend Colonel Pickering that he can transform Eliza Doolittle, a chance-met and much bedraggled Covent Garden flower-girl, into a young lady presentable in the best society. The test is to be her appearance at a garden-party six months later. In Eliza's transformation the emphasis is laid on the processes of cleansing and re-clothing; her education in deportment and enunciation is singularly suggestive of that of Peregrine's "nymph"; like that young person she is bought from her father, taken to the opera, given a preliminary introduction to society at a tea in Mrs. Higgins' apartment, and scores a triumph at the garden party. Although the hoax on society is not discovered immediately afterwards, the play ends when Eliza leaves Higgins and Pickering, and Mr. Shaw explains in an epilogue that she marries Freddy Hill, a rather useless young chap, and with the assistance of her friends, sets up a flower shop in which she and her husband find their true vocation.

There are, of course, differences between the play and the episode. Alfred Doolittle, for instance, has, as Eliza's father, far greater



prominence in the play than the beggar-woman had in the novel; Freddy Hill and Peregrine's Swiss valet, who play corresponding rôles, differ at least in social rank; and Smollett had no persons analogous to Colonel Pickering and Mrs. Higgins. Nevertheless, as Professor Tatlock has pointed out, the underlying satiric purpose of both authors was the same, and the correspondence among minor and major incidents is exceedingly close. In novel, as in play:

- 1) The meetings between the girls and the men who transform them are pure chance;
- 2) the girls are purchased for small sums from their parents;
- 3) the processes of cleansing and re-clothing are amusingly emphasized, as well as the girls' reaction to these processes;
- 4) The methods of social education are nearly identical;
- 5) There are preliminary introductions to selected groups;
- 6) The débuts in society are triumphant;
- 7) The girls leave their benefactors to marry persons of much less importance in the story;
- 8) The young couples, assisted by the respective "Pygmalsions," set up successfully in shop-keeping.

It would be hard to find, from internal evidence, a clearer case of borrowing. It would likewise be hard to find a case in which borrowing was more justified by the results. Plagiarism, in any evil sense of the word, could be charged to Mr. Shaw as little as to Shakespeare, who apparently did precisely the same sort of thing. Since Mr. Shaw, however, has the advantage of being very much alive, the present writer had the temerity to send a note of inquiry regarding this strange similarity. The reply may be taken as a warning against too hasty acceptance of internal evidence as to sources. It speaks for itself:

10 Adelphi Terrace, W. C. 2  
27th May, 1925

Dear Sir,

Mr. Bernard Shaw desires me to say that his attention has been called repeatedly to *Peregrine Pickle* since *Pygmalion* appeared. This is interesting as shewing that people still read Smollett. He never read P. P.: Humphrey Clinker was his sole boyish excursion into Smollett. This is lucky as otherwise his play might have been prevented or aborted. The experiment of two writers of fiction treating the same subject and pro-

ducing the same series of incidents—the same result practically—shews that the human imagination always runs in the same grooves, and that this is the explanation of almost all the alleged plagiarisms.

Yours faithfully,

BLANCHE PATCH,  
*Secretary.*

*Yale University.*

E. S. NOYES.

### THE ANATOMIST DISSECTED—BY LEMUEL GULLIVER

The vogue of "Gulliver" as a *nom-de-plume*, which followed closely upon the publication by Swift of his famous *Travels*, concerned itself chiefly with imitations of the satire of "Lilliput." The attack upon pedantry in "Laputa," however, gave birth to a very curious tract in ridicule of the researches of the Royal Society. The full title is as follows:

The Anatomist Dissected; or the man-midwife finely brought to bed. Being an examination of the conduct of Mr. St. André touching the late pretended rabbit-bearer. By Lemuel Gulliver. Surgeon and anatomist to the kings of Lilliput and Balnibarbi, and fellow of the Academy of Sciences in Blefuscu. London, 1727.

The allusion is to the claim of one Mary Tofts to have given birth to eighteen rabbits at one confinement. Contemporaries differ as to the number of rabbits born. No less than a half a dozen tracts on the controversy are mentioned by the pamphleteers. Incidentally, the affair of Mary Tofts gives us the certain explanation of the obscure passage at the close of Mrs. Howard's letter to Swift, November 17, 1726, the interpretation of which has hitherto escaped the commentators. The passage referred to is as follows:

I cannot conclude without telling you, that our island is in great joy; one of our Yahoos . . . has brought forth four perfect black rabbits. May we not hope . . . that in time our female Yahoos will produce a race of Houyhnhnms?

In *The Anatomist Dissected* the satire is ostensibly directed at Mr. St. André, the attending physician who attested the confinement; but in reality, the victims of ridicule are the fellows of the Royal Society. In the Introduction, "Gulliver" describes the prevailing excitement among the scientists, their feverish efforts to

refute the miracle and to rescue the laws of biology from chaos. In the body of the tract he imitates and of course distorts their pompous diction and learned arguments. The thesis is of no interest to us now; but the manner, which is typically Gulliverian and uniquely Laputan, entitles the pamphlet to a place along with the better-known apocrypha of *Gulliver's Travels*.

After entertaining the public with my Travels (he begins) I little thought any private occurrence in so small a spot as the island of Great Britain could have roused my attention and broke in upon that repose in which I hoped to spend the remains of a declining life. But small and inconsiderable as it is, I consider that it is my own country. . . My inextinguishable thirst after truth, and an ardent inclination of communicating it to others have prevailed upon me once more to be exposed in print in order to express my abhorrence of a late diabolical imposture, namely the rabbit affair, which has been the real and only cause why the publication of my Travels has been so neglected of late, which by the decay of the sale has sensibly affected a worthy and honest bookseller. . . My motive for entering the lists is my skill in surgery and the great ignorance which Mr. St. André has betrayed on this occasion. . .

With characteristic flippancy, Gulliver proceeds to ridicule the whole affair, and St. André in particular for failing to "smell a rat instead of a rabbit":

In the kingdom of Balnibarbi, this virtuoso (St. André) would have been adopted into the Academy of Sciences. Nay, it is ten to one but he would be taken up into the flying island and appointed anatomist extraordinary to the court of Laputa.

The tract is marked by its derision of the methods of research, but this after all is superficial and negligible. For us it is interesting chiefly as another page in the hitherto unbound volume of writings produced under the direct influence of *Gulliver's Travels*.<sup>1</sup>

*American University, Cairo, Egypt.*

WILLIAM A. EDDY.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the bibliography and discussion of the entire corpus of *Gulliveriana*, see the writer's "*Gulliver's Travels—A Critical Study*." (Princeton University Press.)

## REVIEWS.

---

*Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*, by J. W. KRUTCH.  
New York, Columbia University Press, 1924.

The drama of the Restoration and the early eighteenth century has of late years attracted considerable scholarly attention: Messrs. Bernbaum, Nicoll and Dobrée have published fair-sized volumes; besides these, there is more than one doctorate dissertation in manuscript; and a full list of articles and notes on the Collier controversy and other pertinent subjects would make a very respectable bibliography. Dr. Krutch's volume can, therefore, hardly be said to open a new field, and one is at once struck by the paucity of reference to those who have preceded him, and by the lack of any bibliography of recent works on his subject; but, in spite of this, his book is a valuable summary of the relations of English comedy to the actual social conditions that the plays portrayed and to the rising dramatic criticism of the period.

Dr. Krutch explains Restoration comedy as pure contemporary realism, its immorality as the reflection of the indecency in current fashionable conversation and of the unfeeling egotism and cynicism in contemporary manners and philosophy. These social conditions, as the author shows, obtained almost solely among the nobility, and the drama that reflected them was supported by the two social extremes; the middle class read Baxter and Bunyan, and eschewed stage plays. Restoration comedy as a literary tradition continued after the Revolution of 1688; but, even several years before Collier published his *Short View*, the rise of the middle class under William and Mary and the improved example of the Court were reacting on society in general and to some degree even on the drama: "Books and the theater became less and less the affair only of the aristocracy; and the middle class, which was not only more regular in life but also less capable of regarding literature with moral detachment, made its influence felt."<sup>1</sup> The main thesis, therefore, of more than half of the book would seem to be somewhat as follows: just as Restoration comedy represented actual conditions and the cynical perversity of the Court of Charles II; so sentimental comedy represented, if not actual conditions, at least the sentimental perversity of the bourgeois classes who in the 1690's assumed an important place as literary patrons; and the truth of this attitude, which is borne out by extensive data collected

<sup>1</sup> Krutch, 153. See also the following pages, especially on the Societies for the Reformation of Manners.

in the volume, is further attested by such documents as Heywood's *Woman Killed With Kindness* in which sentimentalism as a bourgeois tendency appears even in late Elizabethan drama before Puritanism had quite withdrawn the middle classes from the theater.

Strangely enough, however, after an interesting survey of dramatic criticism and the beginnings of dramatic reviewing, Dr. Krutch seems definitely to repudiate this thesis: "... Sentimental Comedy," he says, "was not a spontaneous expression but a machine-made product constructed in accordance with definite rules";<sup>2</sup> sentimental philosophy was apparently not especially characteristic of the early eighteenth century bourgeois; in the change from Restoration comedy to sentimental comedy the only significance of the rise of the middle classes is negative—they objected to the profane and the obscene—and the fact that sentimentalism rather than some other philosophic and artistic point of view replaced the old attitude, Dr. Krutch attributes to the rise of dramatic criticism about the year 1700. Of course, literary criticism was an influence; but surely Dennis and even Collier<sup>3</sup> himself were as much opposed to sentimental drama as was Steele in favor of it; criticism, therefore, was divided; and, furthermore, if literary criticism is to be looked upon as determining the rise of sentimental drama, one should surely find at least one early critical document of a clearly sentimental trend to account for the spectacular success of Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* in 1696. Apparently, no such document exists. Dramatic criticism played an undoubted part in the movement; but one feels that Dr. Krutch has allowed the subject-matter of his later chapters too much weight in his conclusions.

The prose in which the book is written is on the whole not only clear but readable. Occasional neat phrases stand out almost like epigrams: "... the sophisticated yet uncynical advocacy of virtue which made the triumph of the *Spectator*,"<sup>4</sup> for example. The discussion of Mrs. Centlivre's *Artifice* is not without an ironic appositeness:

Face to face with a cast-off mistress, the hero offers her a one-third share in his affections, and she refuses. Then with that strange susceptibility to conversion which began to manifest itself in rakes about the year 1700, he is about to turn honorable when she tells him that, anticipating no such conclusion, she has just given him poison. The fear of matrimony is allayed by the prospect of death, and he agrees to atone for

---

<sup>2</sup> Krutch, 249. See also 257.

<sup>3</sup> See his attack on Cibber in the *Short View*.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Krutch admits this to be the first Sentimental Comedy, p. 202.

<sup>5</sup> Krutch, 213.

past sins by marrying her. Of course the draught turns out not to be fatal and the couple are left to live happily ever after, or at least as happily as the reader can imagine them to have.\*

JOHN W. DRAPER.

*University of Maine.*

---

*A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, by ERNEST WEEKLEY. New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, 1924.

Since the history of words wins a popular interest not accorded to any other branch of linguistic science, Professor Ernest Weekley's *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* is a welcome addition to our handy reference books. The work is an abridgment of the author's *Etymological Dictionary* published in 1921, having been made concise by the omission of quotation and comment rather than by a reduction in the number of entries. It includes a brief account of the tradition of English speech (not found in the earlier work), select bibliographies of word-books, a glossary of technical linguistic terms, and brief etymologies of more than 35,000 words. Like all British word-books, this dictionary fails to fit the American vocabulary precisely. One finds such recent terms as *Cheka*, *poilu*, *blimp*, *pogo*, but not *cater-cornered*, *jerkwater*, *cafeteria*, *jitney*; and it is surprising to find the *jimmy* of the American burglar listed as a *james* or a *jemmy*. The soldier slang of a decade ago, now happily in the way to obsolescence, is well represented. Though the loss of the citations of the larger work is unfortunate, there is a gain in convenience of reference, and the book is readable and useful.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*La Jeunesse d'Anatole France, 1844-1876*, par GEORGES GIRARD. Nouvelle Revue Française, 1925. 233 pages.

*Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France*, par MICHEL CORDAY. Calmann-Lévy, 1925. 197 pages.

These two books make a valuable addition to the works of Anatole France in that, by making public his earliest writings and those that were unpublished at the time of his death, they give us a complete idea of his literary development from the very beginning to the end of his career.

\* Krutch, 221.

The charming and profusely illustrated study of M. Girard begins with the *Nouvelles Pensées et Maximes Chrétiennes par Anatole*, 1852, *prix 50 centimes*. At the age of seven he feels his vocation as an author sufficiently to draw up a title-page and fix the price of his work. A little later he composes a *Choix de Maximes, parva sed dilecta*, according to the inscription on the cover. His school-boy diary shows dislike of school, but, in spite of this, some of his literary compositions were notable and are still precious preserved in the archives of the Collège Stanislas: the *Légende de Guttenberg*, 1859; *Légende de Sainte-Radégonde*, his first printed work, and *Légende de la Récluse*, 1860; *Le goût des Jardins* and *Méditation sur les Ruines de Palmyre*, 1861. His interest in the historical and legendary is already keen and is further evidenced by his letters from Normandy in 1859 and 1861. On the last page of the *Légende de Guttenberg*, he drew a plan which showed a line leading from his father's shop to the Academy. One is reminded of the youthful Hugo and his, "Je veux être Chateaubriand ou rien." His articles in the *Amateur d'auto-graphes* from 1867 on show his love for Greek and Latin antiquity, the sixteenth century, and Rabelais, Rénier and Molière in the classic period, and the pagan charm of the eighteenth. One finds in them ideas, personages, and whole passages which appear in later works. The thirty-eight rather mediocre love-poems show the influence of Gautier, Leconte de Lisle and, especially, Hugo. The play, *Sir Punch*, is a combination of the Falstaff and Don Juan ideas. His letters during the Commune relate his escape from Paris and exile at Versailles. In 1873, the *Poèmes dorés* win him universal recognition.

At the close of his long career, he left a number of unfinished manuscripts, which are examined by Monsieur Corday in his book. Part of them are a series of dialogues, intended to be published under the title *Sous la rose*. In the *Dialogue sur l'existence de Dieu et la métaphysique*, he rallies man's pretention to find anything other than himself in his metaphysics or his concept of God. In the *Dialogue sur la vieillesse*, he deplores the weakness of old age and finds caution rather than wisdom in old men. In the *Dialogue sur l'avenir*, he forsee the disappearance of the human race from the globe, which, in its turn, will be destroyed. In the *Dialogue sur la pudeur*, he finds Christianity, due to its disdain of the flesh, has exaggerated pudor to a distasteful extent. In the *Entretien sur la guerre*, which dates from the war itself, he assumes the position of the socialists and hopes they will realize the United States of the World. Anatole France's indignation at the useless prolongation of the war is shown in the well-known "lettre a R. . ." which Monsieur Corday has reproduced and which Anatole France intended to insert in this dialogue. The

*Entretien sur l'astronomie* takes us through space, where worlds are born and die as our own must die. He wonders again if life on the globe is not due to mold or decomposition.

In addition to these dialogues, Anatole France left several "projets." Toward the end of 1919, he planned a novel to be called "*le Cyclope, une satire tragique et bouffonne de l'humanité, du genre de la Révolte des Anges et l'Île des Pingouins.*" Twenty centuries after Napoleon, the race of cyclops has re-appeared and, no progress having been realized in their absence, wages war as in the days of old. He told the reporters who interviewed him when he received the Nobel prize that he intended to write a book against war. "Ce livre, je veux le faire tel qu'il offense le moins possible de gens, le moins possible de maréchaux et même de caporaux." He also planned a novel on Napoleon. The latter lands from Elba and lodges for the night at the house of one of his partisans whose daughter has just fallen ill with the measles. One may imagine what the irony of Anatole France would have done with this situation and how vastly more important the illness of the little girl would have seemed to the parents than the emperor and his world-shaking business. Besides these works, he had also planned a novel having the mild Firmin Piedagnel of *l'Orme du mail* as its hero, a continuation of *la Révolte des Anges* and a novel entitled *Monsieur Gaulard*, another ironical portrait to add to those of professors in *Pierre Nozière*, *le Petit Pierre*, and *la Vie en fleur*.

J. K. DITCHY.

*University of Minnesota.*

*L'Algérie dans la Littérature Française.* Par CHARLES TAILLIART, Vice-Recteur de l'Académie d'Alger. Paris, Champion, 1925. vi, 676 pp.—*Essai de Bibliographie Méthodique et Raisonnée.* Paris, Champion, 1925. vi, 466 pp.

L'auteur de ces deux gros volumes a élevé un véritable monument d'érudition patiente, probe et éclairée à une "province" française qu'il aime, qu'il connaît et qu'il a parcourue, en observateur attentif, épris des paysages et de toutes les manifestations de la vie, pendant plus d'un quart de siècle. Il a été un des témoins de ce choc des races qui se prolongera encore sans doute longtemps dans l'Afrique du Nord et par toute son attitude montre bien qu'il est un de ceux qui peuvent aider à rendre moins dangereux les conflits qui peuvent encore se produire. La première partie de ce travail, destinée à établir les différentes étapes qu'a parcouru l'opinion publique française à l'égard de l'Algérie pendant près d'un siècle ne nous appartient pas. Elle était cependant loin



d'être inutile. Après avoir rapidement repris les indications déjà données par M. Martino dans son livre sur *L'Orient dans la Littérature Française*, M. Tailliar arrive à cette conclusion que "de tout cela les Français de 1830 ne connaissaient à peu près rien. L'ignorance, à cette date, des choses et des gens de la Régence d'Alger était à peu près absolue" (p. 45). Les trois premiers chapitres montrent comment, graduellement, l'intérêt pour la nouvelle colonie s'est accru et contiennent des pages pénétrantes sur la psychologie des conquérants dont les portraits sont vigoureusement brossés. Avec le chapitre IV, nous arrivons à *L'Algérie dans les ouvrages purement descriptifs* (p. 322). M. Tailliar a remis dans son cadre Fromentin pour qui il a un faible marqué; c'est au tout premier rang qu'il le place parmi ses contemporains et même ses successeurs Guillaumet, Masqueray, Louis Bertrand et Isabelle Eberhardt. Malgré les nombreux récits qui avaient été écrits avant *Un été dans le Sahara* et *Un été dans le Sahel*, Fromentin n'en a pas moins fait pour le paysage africain ce que Chateaubriand avait fait pour le paysage américain: il en a révélé la beauté et les couleurs à ses compatriotes et son influence se prolonge nettement jusqu'à nos jours. Par contre, l'Algérie n'a guère inspiré les poètes. Parmi les vers que cite M. Tailliar, les meilleurs semblent être ceux de Jules Lemaitre que M. Martino avait déjà signalés. Encore faut-il remarquer que Lemaitre ne connaît guère qu'Alger et que la lumière cruelle du Sud blesse de façon douloureuse ses yeux de Beauceron accoutumés à des paysages modérés.

La liste des romans sur l'Algérie est beaucoup plus longue et beaucoup plus riche, et la nouvelle colonie fournit déjà de nombreux sujets de romans, d'ailleurs assez médiocres, peu d'années après la conquête. M. Tailliar signale le fait que Balzac avait l'intention d'écrire des romans algériens, il aurait pu indiquer que, dans *la Cousine Bette*, l'épisode du vieux Fisher pourrait déjà être considéré comme une esquisse de l'un de ces romans. De cette masse de plus de 200 volumes, où l'auteur à juste raison a fait une place aux romans populaires, quelques œuvres de tout premier ordre se dégagent: plusieurs romans de Louis Bertrand qui ont des chances d'être de vrais chefs-d'œuvre, un roman de Robert Randau et des pages, sinon des ouvrages entiers d'Isabelle Eberhardt. Quant au théâtre, il vaut autant n'en point parler.

Cette littérature a un aspect particulier sur lequel M. Tailliar attire l'attention: tout d'abord on y rencontre peu d'indigènes, et souvent ceux que l'on y rencontre paraissent peu vraisemblables et bien superficiellement observés. C'est qu'au total nous sommes en pays musulman et en pays oriental et que la vie de famille reste cachée par le mur de la tente ou le mur d'argile aux yeux européens. Il est d'ailleurs fort remarquable, et tout à l'éloge de M. Tailliar, que malgré sa longue expérience du pays, il ne prétend

pas être arrivé à une connaissance plus intime de ce mystère de l'âme étrangère que ne l'ont fait les auteurs qu'il analyse. Les seules femmes qu'ont pu connaître Fromentin, Feydeau, les Gôncourt, Gautier, ne sont que les spécialistes des danses orientales; pour les autres, même, chose piquante, pour Isabelle Eberhardt, "les créations de l'esprit se sont substituées à la réalité" (p. 582). On me permettra ici, d'exprimer un regret en passant, c'est que M. Tailliar n'ait point quelque part dans son ouvrage ramassé les indications qu'il donne en des chapitres séparés pour montrer comment "ces créations de l'esprit" avaient pris naissance et comment certains types, d'ailleurs faux, avaient fini par s'imposer. On hésite, devant un travail d'une telle dimension, à indiquer que certains aspects du sujet auraient pu être étudiés plus complètement. Tout en reconnaissant avec M. Tailliar que le catholicisme n'a pu s'étendre et gagner dans un pays primitivement musulman et chez des indigènes qui sont encouragés à se développer dans le sens de leur religion, on s'étonnera un peu que le nom du Cardinal Lavigerie n'ait été mentionné qu'une fois et en note (p. 298). De plus, au moins pour les vingt ou trente dernières années, je crois qu'il y aurait eu avantage, au moins en ce qui concerne les chapitres sur la littérature proprement dite, à étendre cette enquête à toute l'Afrique du Nord. Deux des ouvrages les plus importants de Charles Géniaux, *Notre petit gourbi*, et surtout *Le choc des races* sont ainsi omis, sans doute parce que tunisiens. J'aurais aimé à savoir si Mme de Lens dans *Le Harem entr'ouvert* et dans *L'Etrange aventure d'Aguida* n'a pas un peu mieux pénétré que tant d'autres le mystère de l'âme orientale. Il semble bien que le roman marocain de Nolly qui a pour titre *Le Conquérant* traite du même sujet et décrive les mêmes types que *La Cina*, et *Pepete le Bien-Aimé* de Louis Bertrand ou que l'ouvrage de Géniaux dont nous venons de parler. M. Tailliar indique d'ailleurs lui-même (p. 491) que les jeunes écrivains de la Tunisie, de l'Algérie et du Maroc essaient depuis quelques années de se grouper pour créer une littérature nord-africaine, ce qui indique à tout le moins une volonté commune, des aspirations communes et un désir d'unification qu'on ne peut négliger. Je m'empresse d'ailleurs d'ajouter qu'il s'agit ici d'un regret plus que d'une critique; M. Tailliar ayant délimité son sujet a voulu ne parler que de ce dont il était certain, que des pays qu'il avait vus et que de la vie avec laquelle il a eu pendant si longtemps un contact direct. A cet ouvrage si riche et si documenté est jointe une bibliographie systématique qui ne comprend pas moins de 3177 articles. On y trouvera autre chose qu'une simple énumération: dans la plupart des cas, l'auteur a donné en de courtes analyses la substance des articles qu'il cite et au moins un sommaire des livres mentionnés. C'est un instrument

de travail indispensable pour qui veut écrire sur l'Algérie ou étudier à nouveau un des aspects les plus attrayants de l'exotisme contemporain.

GILBERT CHINARD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

*Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizieme Siècle.* Par EDMOND HUGUET. Fascicules 1, 2. Paris: Champion, 1925. lxxvi + 80 pp.

The two fascicules that have appeared contain the preface, which is full of linguistic information, and the word list up to the word *advenement*. In form the book will resemble the *Dictionnaire général* and be about twice its size. The author proposes to include only words and locutions found in the sixteenth century and no longer in use, words then employed with different meanings from those they have today, and words which have survived with the same meanings but for which he has found an earlier first date than that given in the *Dictionnaire général*. He also points out changes in pronunciation (*Jérusalem*), syllabification (*paon*, *poète*), morphology (*canals*, *resolvis*), and syntax (genders, transitives that are now intransitives). The work is based chiefly on the study of some three or four hundred texts of which the list is given. Where so much labor has been expended, one hesitates to suggest further investigation, but it seems to me that the *rhétoriciens*, who must be a fruitful field for words, have been somewhat neglected and that the work of men like Malherbe and d'Urfé that was published in the sixteenth century ought to be included, even though, as M. H. says, they belong in the main to the seventeenth. On the other hand, he is altogether justified in including d'Aubigné, Brantôme, Regnier, sixteenth century men whose work was printed after the century closed. I am sorry, however, he did not carry the investigation further and study not only Dumas's *Lydie* (1609), but Hardy and other writers of the early seventeenth century, whose work would reward linguistic investigation. M. H. usually consults editions published during the author's lifetime, or modern critical editions, but occasionally, as in the case of Rabelais and Ronsard, where he clings to Marty-Laveaux, he fails to employ the most reliable editions. Such defects are, however, of small consequence. If the method outlined in the preface and applied in the first 80 pages is carried out with the same diligence and acumen that have been displayed thus far, the work, except for its chronological limitations, will rank with Godefroy,

Littre and Tobler. It will be one of the chief contributions made in this century to French studies, one that no university can afford to do without.

H. C. LANCASTER.

---

*Liber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie.* Published at Vienna in 1731 by Bernard Pez. Reprinted by T. F. Crane. New York: Oxford University Press, 1925.

This collection of forty-four miracles of the Virgin, written in Latin, was first published by Pez from a Heiligenkreuz manuscript in 1731. The book, suppressed immediately because of certain details in it offensive to the imperial Austrian chancellor and to the prefect of the imperial court library at Vienna, became so rare that only a few examples are known to have survived. Professor Crane was fortunate enough to have at his disposition the Harvard University copy, and we are even more fortunate, not only in having the work at last made available, but in the editor who has performed that task.

Between 1887 and 1898 Adolfo Mussafia in a series of five articles in the *Sitzungsberichte* of Vienna attempted to trace the origins and relationships of the many collections of Miracles of the Virgin that have come down to us. His work is of course invaluable, but the fact that so much of it is based upon Pez's collection has hitherto created difficulties for the many students to whom that collection was inaccessible. Professor Crane has now printed the full text of Pez and has added his own bibliographical notes on each of the forty-four stories (pp. 82-107) together with a convenient table of comparisons (pp. 118-9) indicating where the same tales are to be found in the other great collections of Miracles of the Virgin. He has also reduced to order and clarity Mussafia's necessarily scattered and occasionally obscure references to Pez, and notwithstanding the brevity of his Introduction he has paused long enough in several instances (cf. p. xx) to suggest alluring by-paths for others to investigate. Needless to say, all students of the subject will find the volume indispensable.

The book, however, is something more than the work of an exceedingly competent scholar. It appeared soon after the author's eightieth birthday and it includes a Bibliography of his writings from 1868 to 1924 that contains some 331 titles exclusive of the present work. Professor Crane in his Preface (p. x) expresses the hope that his record may be of encouragement to younger scholars and "show that in spite of the administrative duties which

claim, perhaps unfortunately, so much time from American college teachers, it is possible to continue productive work." Such a record will indeed encourage younger scholars, especially when they discover that these books, papers, and reviews cover an amazingly wide range of subjects and reveal an author who is at once a specialist and a humanist. And if such an example prove an incentive to the younger generation, this volume itself will be stimulating to those not so young, for only older scholars can fully appreciate what it means to print an exhaustive and authoritative piece of research at the age of four score years.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

---

*The Fable of the Bees.* By BERNARD MANDEVILLE. Edited, with a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory, by F. B. Kaye. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1924. Two volumes, pp. cxlvi, 412; 481.

Mandeville's *Fable* is surprisingly timely. Its discussions of luxury, morals, trade, and the search for happiness read like commentaries on present day matters. Its famous paradox is not inapplicable to modern life. Most of all, perhaps, Mandeville's penetrating analysis of sentimentalized morality appeals to the observer of contemporary American life. Even the essay on Charity Schools has present value in what is said about colleges and learning, and the remarks on the place of Latin and on special occupational training represent one section of current educational theory. The style is astonishingly modern. Whole passages in Part I, capitalization and punctuation altered, might appear in one of our sprightly journals of opinion without seeming out of key. The dialogues in Part II are less easily converted, but they are lively reading. We hear much of social psychology in these days; here is social psychology written in a former age, but if it is not for all time, it is fitted, in many ways, to this present.

For making it a delight to read this old book modern readers are deeply indebted to Professor Kaye and to his publishers. The two volumes are splendid examples of modern printing. No expense has been spared: the reproduction of the ornaments of James Roberts, the master printer who created the format of the original Part II; the special types for the prefaces and the type used in the text itself; the careful study of the title pages for this new edition and the reproductions of title pages of all the older editions—these elements add distinction to the book. Merely to have given us a sumptuous edition of the text would have been high service; Professor Kaye has done much more. His text is carefully edited,

with full critical apparatus. He has supplied, in his notes, a learned commentary. In an appendix he gives extracts from critical essays. There is a chronological list of references to Mandeville, with brief notes, so that we have in compact form a complete history of the book and of its reputation. The canon of the works is determined. There is an extremely valuable index to the commentary, which will be consulted by many students not primarily interested in the *Fable*. The detailed introduction is a book in itself, the most considerable account of Mandeville's system of thought. In printing, in text, and in scholarly apparatus this edition is a contribution of the first rank.

Professor Kaye's purpose, he tells us, is to orient Mandeville in the stream of thought. While he gives much valuable information, in his notes, concerning sources, his object has been rather to supply the proper background for understanding Mandeville's relation to the history of thought than to spend undue time upon source-hunting. He disposes of the legends about Mandeville's life; important documents are reproduced; the biography is as complete as can be expected in view of the paucity of records after 1703 and the lack of first-hand evidence as to the author's character and habits except what he himself has told us.

The interpretation of Mandeville's thought is based not on the paradox or on the relation to Shaftesbury, common ground for criticism, but upon its essential empiricism. Paradox and contradiction are implicit in the thought of the time, and Professor Kaye gives an excellent summary of the conflicting currents. The essential paradox of the *Fable* is not in the idea that evil has a good side but in the definition of virtue. Mandeville adopted both the ascetic ideal and the ideal of conduct according to the dictates of reason. Virtue is defined as the result of acts by which man, "contrary to the impulse of nature should endeavour the benefit of others or the conquest of his own passions out of a rational ambition of being good." To this blend of asceticism and rationalism, from which emotion is excluded, Mr. Kaye gives the name "rigorism." The word is in Mandeville, though not quite in Mr. Kaye's sense, which is Kantian. Mandeville's pessimism is due to the fact that when he examined the world in the light of his formula he found all action due to selfishness. If all selfish action were removed, trade, that is, prosperity, would end. Consequently, he advised the abandonment of the attempt "to make a great an honest hive." But Mr. Kaye's analysis of the *reductio ad absurdum* in Mandeville's thought, in which he holds Bayle's influence paramount, seems somewhat contradictory to his later explanation. In one place he implies that Mandeville, having adopted this theory, turned to an examination of the phenomena of society; in another, that "rigorism" was merely a final twist to a scheme based on a worldly

morality. It is true that Mr. Kaye distinguishes between Mandeville's "rigorism" and the incipient utilitarianism which was to develop such profound influence. And he rightly emphasizes Mandeville's contempt for all transcendentalism. Mandeville was an empiricist, and "an intense one." In holding that the use of the ascetic formula is "simply a final twist given to his thought after it has been worked out in harmony with the opposite or empiric viewpoint"; a "kind of candle-snuffer," indicating his innate opposition to the ascetic ideal, Mr. Kaye appears to abandon "rigorism" as the key to Mandeville's thought.

This "rigorism," after all, seems to differ little from the ethical system, classical in origin, which holds that the rational principle in the soul is a sufficient guide to virtue. It is the theme of the second book of the *Faerie Queene*, for example, in which Divine Grace plays a very slight part, as contrasted with the teaching of the first book, which is ascetic in Mr. Kaye's sense. Spenser keeps the two forms of asceticism perfectly clear and distinct; they are not in the state of unstable equilibrium which Mr. Kaye holds to be the essential characteristic of thought in the seventeenth century. The impression which we ultimately get from Mr. Kaye's exposition is that the rigoristic philosophy, whether in itself an attempt to reconcile two diverse interpretations of virtue or not, is certainly not Mandeville's, which is pure empiricism. In this, of course, Mandeville points the materialistic philosophy of the day, carried even farther than Hobbes; his work is a climax of an intellectual movement whose beginnings in English thought we detect in Spenser and Shakespeare and which was immensely stimulated by the philosophy of progress implicit in Bacon and the new science. Mr. Kaye not only speaks of the rigoristic philosophy as a "final twist" given to Mandeville's thought, but shows, in later sections of his book, that it was bound up with a species of camouflage, a protective coloration, to keep on good terms with the Fundamentalists. Thus, Mr. Kaye holds that Mandeville is "not to be believed" when he professes a preference for "the Road that leads to Virtue." His definition of Virtue, if sincere, would make all progress impossible; he really abandons his position, and prefers the great hive.

Therefore Mr. Kaye concentrates rightly not upon the paradox but upon the empiricism of Mandeville. This he defines as a theory of philosophical anarchism plus utilitarianism in practice. There is no final criterion for conduct. Distinctions are arbitrary, varying with the individual. This does not mean encouragement of vice, for the State punishes crime. The thesis is not that all evil is public benefit, but that some evil may not really be felt to be evil. In his explanation of Mandeville's account of the invention of virtues and of society Mr. Kaye is on sounder ground than Leslie

Stephen, who speaks of it as "this preposterous theory." The theory is an allegory, imitative of many similar accounts in earlier writers, including Lucretius; that it is not to be taken literally is proved by Mandeville's later explanation, in Part II, of his meaning, in which we have a fairly accurate statement of evolutionary theory as applied to the development of civilization.

In the chapter on intellectual background Mr. Kaye draws a useful distinction between Mandeville's conception of irrationality, which was psychological, and the familiar pyrrhonism of the Renaissance. He holds that Mandeville is less interested in proving that reason is impotent than in showing that the process is always at the bidding of some sub-rational desire. He remarks acutely that the popular attitude was a compound of antagonistic intellectual reagents needing only the proper shock of one upon the other to cause an explosion. This shock was supplied by Mandeville. He gained his effect by his consciousness of a contradiction in current opinion which had escaped his contemporaries. This observation is substantiated by the entire essay, which shows not only the intrinsic interest of the *Fable* but also its relations to the thought of the time. Its influence Mr. Kaye outlines at the end of what must be regarded as one of the most considerable and illuminating of recent analyses of a great chapter in the history of English thought.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

---

*The English Versions of The Ship of Fools*, by Fr. Aurelius Pompen, O. F. M. xiv + 345 pp. Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1925.

This impressive study is one of the outstanding contributions of recent years to the interpretation of Early Tudor Literature. As stated in the Introduction, the author has a three-fold purpose: "To bring both Barclay and Watson somewhat nearer to the student of English literature, and correctly to appraise their historical and literary value"; "to throw some light on the methods of the old translators"; and to correct the universal mistake that Barclay knew Brant's *Narrenschiff* and in part translated from it. To this task Fr. Aurelius brings a wide knowledge of the scholarship dealing with the early Renaissance period and an adequate appreciation of method.

Topic by topic the author compares from the earliest editions the original German text by Brant, the Latin text by Locher—a friend of Brant's, Professor of Rhetoric and Poetry at Freiburg—the French verse paraphrase by Riviere, the French prose paraphrase by Drouyn, and the English poetical version by Barclay and prose



version by Watson. "When I began my study," says Fr. Aurelius, "I had no doubt that Barclay made his translation from the German or at least under German influence, as all the handbooks of English literature have it." What he actually discovered was that Barclay does not owe a single line directly to Brant, whose text he could not read, but that, with slight obligation to Riviere, he translates, adapts and amplifies the Latin version of Locher; that Locher, a mere schoolmaster and pedantic devotee of classical patterns, in no sense translated Brant, making, rather, a haphazard selection or paraphrase of a few lines at the beginning of a section, missing altogether the pungency of Brant, and freely introducing his own flat moralizations and classical allusions, reproducing, in short, "hardly a third part of Brant's ideas . . . and not more than a tenth part of his grimmest sarcasm"; and that Barclay in turn reworks Locher into a version four times as long, following in the main the ideas of Locher but adding and amplifying, governed in part by "the unbearable prolixity of an old-fashioned preacher," in part by his homely wit and lively sense of reality. As for Watson, he translates perfunctorily and blunderingly the version of Drouyn, with only a very occasional dash of fresh local color of his own.

A comparative table of all the chapters of *The Ship of Fools* in the different versions and editions furnishes other scholars with a convenient key for further comparative work.

The disappointing feature of the book is the very brief and general chapter of conclusions. Fr. Aurelius does throw a great deal of light on the method of the early translators, and he does correct the Barclay-Brant tradition, but he does not adequately summarize the historical and literary value of Barclay's poem. From the historical point of view, he was in a position to discriminate closely between the attitudes of characteristic German, French and English minds of the early Renaissance toward medieval, humanistic and reformatory ideas; from the literary point of view, he was in a position to analyze the genius of Barclay and to bring into sharp relief the characteristics of the creative genius of early Tudor England.

The subtitle, "A contribution to the history of the early French Renaissance in England," seems to the reviewer rather forced, for though Watson was a mere abject follower of Drouyn, Barclay—if I have read the parallels aright—worked with a good deal of rather sturdy independence, and, though ignorant of Brant's work, actually reintroduced into the poem much of the idiomatic vigor and spirit of homely satire which distinguished the first version. In this respect the comparative study illustrates the sturdiness and independence of the Teutonic genius at this period.

One hesitates, however, to find fault with so scholarly a book,

which makes English philologists permanently indebted to the author.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

*University of Washington.*

---

“*La Fée aux Miettes.*” *Essai sur le rôle du subconscient dans l'œuvre de Charles Nodier.* Par JULES VODOZ. Paris, Champion, 1925. xvi + 321 pp.

The patently autobiographic character of Nodier's longest fairy-tale is the subject of this psycho-analytic study.

Je n'ai point d'autres souvenirs que ceux de l'enfance, et le dégoût du présent, qui s'est accru avec mes années, a dû fortifier en moi l'habitude instinctive de vivre dans le passé . . . depuis les jours du désabusement, où j'ai reconnu que, hors la vie de l'enfant, il n'y avait rien dans la vie qui valût la peine de vivre . . . Je me suis conservé enfant, par dédain d'être homme. Voilà le secret de ma mémoire et de mes livres.

Thus Nodier in his *Souvenirs de la révolution* (1833, pp. 249-250). Finding here a manifestation of the mother-complex, Monsieur Vodoz confronts the incidents of *La Fée aux Miettes* with those of Nodier's youth, unhappily too often colored, in the *Souvenirs*, by a Romantic imagination. This ingenious but exasperating parallelism loses force by trying to explain everything. The hero Michel is a carpenter, because in 1830 Nodier's star was paling before Hugo's: “après avoir . . . contribué à édifier *la charpente du romantisme* (sic), il était devenu le charpentier que la déveine accompagne. . . ” (p. 71). Psycho-analysis certainly offers large opportunities! For the fairy is first a symbol of the ideal mother denied to Nodier, plus his desire of an intellectual career, then the bride he wedded after falling in love with her mother, then his daughter Marie, whose marriage in 1830 provoked the crisis which produced the *Le Sage*, then *La Sagesse*, and finally the acceptance by the author of his conscious self and all its desires. This finale might have been supported by the revelations on his later life made by Balzac to Mme Hanska! The bailiff of the Isle of Man represents his carnal nature (man, le vieil homme), the dog is a symbol of the incest-motive. The zeal spent in over-elaborating this thesis (the six trees in Michel's garden are compared to the six days of the Creation) might better have been devoted to the question of the literary sources, equally important in a bibliophile and a dreamer alive to all the symbols of folk-lore and rich in mythopoeic fancy. The initial impulse might well have come from Emerson's precursor, Azaïs, for Nodier reviewed his philosophy of compensation in the *Journal des Débats* of 1816. Certainly, the polygraph's desire to be buried with his daughter's wedding veil as shroud and his wife's name on a scarf across his

heart would seem to prove that the father's love remained to the end unconscious of sex, in those far abysses of the heart which Sainte-Beuve wisely refrained from plumbing; and no revelation of the same sullies the image of the lovely girl who still lives for us on the plates of M. Maigrón's *Le romantisme et la mort*. M. Rodoz has done everyone a great service by the 30 page analysis he gives of the romance, and he affords the reader a chance to view, inverted and reflected in a double mirror, a personality which still remains as Protean and ambiguous as it probably was to its possessor.

L. PIAGET SHANKS.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 3-5.* Hrsg. von GEORG MINDE-POUET und JULIUS PETERSEN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1925.

Volumes 3 and 4 in reality constitute but a single volume of 230 pages, with the sub-title *Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft 1923 und 1924*. The most important article in it is by Maria Prigge-Kruhoeffter: "Heinrich von Kleist. Religiosität und Charakter," which takes up more than one third of the volume. Other essays are by Otto Reuter, on Kleist's "Ideenmagazin"; F. K. Roedenmeyer, on *Robert Guiskard*; Walther Kienast, on *Michael Kohlhaas*; Helmuth Rogge, on Kleist and Rahel; Julius Petersen, on Varnhagen and Kleist. Arthur Eloesser reproduces several Kleist portraits, while Otto Pniower contributes two of Henriette Vogel. In addition there are a genealogy of the descendants of Kleist's brother and sisters, a description of the new Kleist-Museum at Frankfort a. O., and a statistical enumeration of the performances of Kleist's plays during the year 1923-24. Finally, Georg Minde-Pouet has again compiled a most valuable Kleist-Bibliography for 1923 and 1924.

The sub-title of the fifth volume of the *Schriften* is: *Kleist's letzte Stunden*, Von Georg Minde-Pouet. Only Part I (*Das Akten-Material*) is here offered. It comprises all the documents, official and private, that have reference to Kleist's death. The bulk of the documents in question was found among the papers of Marie von Kleist, and while one or two had previously been published, it is only in their entirety that we get an authentic picture of the last hours of Kleist and his companion in death. A commentary by the editor is promised for the near future.

It is hardly necessary to add that the *Schriften* of the *Kleist-Gesellschaft* are indispensable to every student of German Literature.

W. KURRELMAYER.

*Chryséide et Arimant, Tragicomédie de Jean Mairet (1625).*

Edition critique par H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER avec la collaboration de C. B. Beall, Joséphine de Boer, Mary Bunworth, G. L. Burton, Eunice R. Goddard, Ruth Rogers. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. 174 pp. Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, v.

This edition offers a scientifically established text, based on the 1630 edition of Rouen with the variants of the Paris edition of the same year and of the Rouen reprint of 1639, ample footnote material, a *glossaire sommaire* of obsolete and rare words and a prefatory study of the poet and his work. The first dozen pages of the Introduction (to p. 19) present a very clear, concise and, at the same time, engaging summary of what is known concerning the life of Mairet. It fixes as far as possible the contested dates, of which there have been not a few, and establishes his importance in the contemporary dramatic development.

Pages nineteen to twenty-eight discuss the sources and literary influences. The relation of the plot to its source, the *Astrée* of d'Urfé, is treated in general with the details left to the footnote parallels which accompany the text. As for the literary influences it appears that Mairet: "Reçoit beaucoup de suggestions de Théophile de Viau, dont il allait être bientôt l'ami intime" (p. 23); and "respecte les bienséances, mais c'est à cause des mœurs littéraires de sa génération plutôt que des règles du théâtre" (p. 25). These statements in their setting give a very clear notion of Mairet from Besançon who, about 1625, seeks to make his way in Paris with this, his first dramatic production. He is quoted (p. 34) as disclaiming any knowledge at this time of the rules which were to be largely indebted to him for their long domination in French dramatic composition. Like Corneille, in his first dramatic effort, he asserts (p. 35): "Je n'avois point de meilleur guide que le sens commun." Nor had he as yet been affected by Malherbe's prescriptions regarding the art of making verse, for here too: "Mairet suit Théophile plutôt que Malherbe" (p. 23; cf. also pages 27 and 29). It is a glimpse of the French drama at a time when it was entering upon one of its most kaleidoscopic developments.

The treatment of the language of the *Chryséide* (pp. 28-32) is admirably succinct and clear and gives the impression of containing all that one needs to know upon this subject. The last few pages are concerned with the representation of the play and the contemporary editions. The notes contain, beside the text variants and the source details, critical comment and parallel verses from contemporary poets quite sufficient to suggest the relation of the poet and his tragi-comedy to the literature of his time.

The text is presented: "avec son ortographe, son accentuation, sa ponctuation, aussi exactement que possible." This fidelity is preserved even to the, at first, somewhat disconcerting arrangement of the verses broken by the dialogue:

Alexandre  
Je n'en veux point douter.  
Bellimand  
Et c'est aussi pourquoi  
Je prens la liberté de me servir de toy. (v. 23-24)

From the second scene of the third act to the end of the play the modern practice is followed. A reviewer in the *Revue Critique* has suggested that in verse 91: "Son *sang* fut plus sanglant que celui d'Illion," *sort* should be substituted for *sang*, although this word occurs in all the contemporary editions. Professor Lancaster writes that he is inclined to accept this emendation.

For years our studies in the early centuries of modern French Literature have been limited largely to the consideration of texts made accessible through publications like the series of Les Grands Ecrivains, La Société des Textes Modernes and the hazards of a limited number of anthologies. It has been next to impossible to procure for our libraries many a text which, in its day, was as popular, as significant, and as potently influential as those which have found greater favor in the eyes of posterity. There could be no greater service to American scholarship than the publication of these works so essential and so difficult of access. Professor Lancaster's selection was a most judicious one. The *Chryséide et Arimant*, with its germs of psychological development (cf. especially the notes to verses 899 ff. and to 1659 ff.) marks an important phase in the evolution of French classic drama; a step in advance of Hardy, a half-step in advance of Théophile, a precursor to his own later work and to that of his contemporaries. It is an impressive solution of the problem: how to combine graduate training and scholarly production.

COLBERT SEARLES.

*University of Minnesota.*

*The Early Novels of Paul Bourget*, by EDGAR MILTON BOWMAN,  
Professor of Romance Languages in Dickinson College. New  
York: Carranza, 1925. 116 pp.

Professor Bowman in his dissertation on the early novels of Bourget, presented at Columbia University, inserts his wedge between *Le Fantôme* and *L'Étape* and the novels fall into two neat groups. On page 50 Professor Bowman informs us that "in the

first group the author (Bourget) aims to learn as much as possible concerning the human heart in general from the particular heart he presents. In the second group he studies some contemporary problems, not solely to understand it (sic) but also to give what he considers the solution."

Such a grouping, based entirely on the date of appearance of the novels, seems extremely arbitrary. Professor Bowman seems to feel this, for in his brief summaries of the novels of the second period on pages 47-48 we read such tempering phrases as: *L'Emigré*: A study of an attitude of mind and therefore resembles novels of the first period; *Némésis*: Seems to revert to his first manner, having much in common with *Cosmopolis*; *La Geôle*: A study of heredity such as Bourget might have written before 1900; etc.

Concerning Professor Bowman's first group it seems to be far from the facts and from Bourget's idea to claim that *Le Disciple* and *La Terre Promise*, to give two outstanding examples, were written purely for the purpose of indulging in psychological analysis. The brief summaries have shown us how unsteadily some of the novels in the second group occupy their places. However, having grouped the novels thus, and having evidenced good faith by giving this brief résumé of each of the second group, Professor Bowman proceeds to examine in detail those of the early period. The plot of each novel is analysed carefully, the chief characters passed in review and in the conclusion, page 102, we see that

Bourget was primarily interested in psychology, desiring to study the states of consciousness of his men and women from the point of view of the scientist and philosopher.

and that

the trait that distinguishes the novels from those of any other author lies in the unifying similarity of the kind of characters which Bourget has chosen to study. Bourget is, when we consider only the novels of this period, the outstanding novelist of certain weaknesses of the younger generation of the last two decades of the nineteenth century in France.

The present reviewer must take issue with Professor Bowman in regard to his translations. In a work which is intended for perusal by specialists, the method is distinctly unscholarly. Only very infrequently are we trusted with the original. Here and there we come upon such stock phrases as "les petits faits de conscience," "les plus minuscules ressorts intimes," etc.; now and then a foot-note is found entire in the original, and, of course, no attempt is made at translating the poetry quoted. One might indeed pardon this lack of consistency, if the translations were always done with the deft stroke of a hand which can banish all reminiscence of odors of mopped floors and washed blackboards, but this is not the case. For instance, on p. 93, there is this bit from *Une Idylle Tragique*: "He had of this age of deep and tragic

turmoil through which we are passing the fatal mark, because it is an infallible mark of decadence in a race."<sup>1</sup>

It is necessary to accuse the author of merely filling space in at least one spot. On p. 19 he says, "To Bourget and his novels one can aptly apply his own words concerning Flaubert." He then launches into a quotation from Bourget which fills half of the page, all of which is quite beside the point except the first sentence of about a dozen words.

There is a good bibliography at the end of the work. Except for it one wonders just what contribution this dissertation makes to our knowledge of Bourget.

JAMES D. SORBER.

*Yale University.*

*Ronsard et son Temps.* Par PIERRE CHAMPION. 24 phototypies hors texte. Paris: Champion, 1925. xviii + 508 pp.

After Laumonier, Longnon, Cohen, de Nolhac, what has a new book of such considerable dimensions to add to our knowledge of Ronsard? M. Champion evidently anticipated this question, for he has undertaken not to make a contribution to literary history or aesthetic criticism, but to write a biography of the poet and the persons to whom he dedicated his poems. As Ronsard was all his life in close association with the court, M. C. gives us portraits of most of the Valois with their celebrated wives and the ladies-in-waiting of the latter, including Cassandre, Hélène, Isabeau, Madeleine de Laubespine. The pageant of the sixteenth century, its festivals and massacres, passes before us as we read and the whole is given unity by the rich and contradictory personality of the poet, while the interest is heightened by frequent quotations from his work and by numerous and well chosen illustrations. At the same time it is a valuable book for the scholar, for the author has read extensively in recent Ronsard literature and has added considerable information from his own historical researches. One finds, for instance, details about Ronsard's life in his province as well as at Paris, his controversies with the Protestants, his connection with the academy of Henri III, etc., that are seldom met with elsewhere. It is an admirable contribution to sixteenth century scholarship, the most imposing that the Tercentenary of Ronsard has produced.<sup>2</sup>

H. C. LANCASTER.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also on page 56 the sentence beginning, "To define a few examples."

<sup>2</sup> Admirers of Mr. Coolidge will be interested in the following (p. 29): "Quand Ronsard sera vieux, il aura toujours un chevalet de bois dans son prieuré; il s'exercera à sauter par la volte, quand il fait mauvais temps."

*Autour de Voltaire, avec quelques inédits.* By F. VÉZINET. Paris, Champion, 1925. viii, 141 pp.

Ce petit volume contient cinq études séparées sur Voltaire et "autour de Voltaire." Trois d'entre elles, qui auraient pu être groupées (*Voltaire et son homme d'affaires à Ferney*, 1-63; *Simon Bigex et le Père Adam*, 90-98 et *Les Crassy et la générosité de Voltaire*, 98-121), ajoutent quelques renseignements intéressants au livre de M. Caussy et aideront à compléter la silhouette de Voltaire seigneur de village qu'il avait esquissée. Voltaire s'y montre âpre à défendre ses intérêts et ses bois, zélé dans la défense de ses serviteurs et prêt à jouer de mauvais tours aux Jésuites. L'étude sur *L'Affaire du chevalier de la Barre et sa répercussion sur Voltaire*, mise au point d'un épisode fort connu, contient en conclusion un inédit assez piquant. On trouvera une nouvelle preuve de la sincérité de Voltaire dans son opposition à la peine de mort dans la lettre qu'il écrivit à Balleidier, procureur de Gez, pour prendre la défense d'un assez mauvais garçon accusé d'avoir volé et violé une passante sur la grand route de Ferney. Voltaire demande qu'on se borne à prendre un arrêt d'expulsion contre "ce malheureux qui est Savoyard" et souhaite qu'il s'en aille "voler ou violer toutes les Savoyardes qu'il lui plairait" (p. 188). La dernière étude du volume, *Rousseau ou Diderot?* reprend la question tant de fois débattue de l'origine du *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts*. M. Vézinet fait la critique des témoignages, met en lumière les contradictions nombreuses de Diderot, insiste sur les déformations évidentes que son imagination infligea en maintes circonstances à la réalité et conclut à la véracité de Rousseau. Il est vrai que Diderot, comme le montre habilement M. Vézinet n'a jamais réclaté formellement, au moins par écrit, la paternité de l'idée centrale du *Discours*, même s'il semble l'avoir souvent fait dans des conversations. Il serait cependant facile de répondre que Rousseau n'a écrit la première version de la fameuse extase qui l'aurait saisi sur la route de Vincennes que douze ans après l'emprisonnement de Diderot et ses visites au donjon (*Lettre à M. de Malesherbes*, 12 janvier 1762), et qu'il a pu lui aussi se laisser piper par son imagination. En l'absence de tout témoignage strictement contemporain le problème risque fort de n'être jamais résolu et fournira encore longtemps un sujet de discussion aux rousseauistes.

GILBERT CHINARD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

June, 1926

Number 6

---

## GENERAL JAMES WILKINSON IN THE KNICKER- BOCKER *HISTORY OF NEW YORK*

Diedrich Knickerbocker's *History of New York* was published by Washington Irving in December, 1809; its readers soon discovered that the book satirized not only Dutch colonial history of the seventeenth century but also American politics of their own day. *The Monthly Anthology and Boston Review* was the first to note the *History's* "good natured satire on the follies and blunders of the present day, and the perplexities they have caused."<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the English *Monthly Review* observed that the book "touches and tickles the political maxims, institutions, and manners of certain other people, not forgetting the . . . Americans."<sup>2</sup> Sir Walter Scott regretted that "as a stranger to American parties and politics, I must lose much of the concealed satire of the piece."<sup>3</sup> In 1825, the erratic American novelist and miscellaneous writer, John Neal, asserted that Irving had satirized certain chief executives of the United States,<sup>4</sup> and that the burlesque Dutch general, Jacobus Von Poffenburgh, "is a portrait—outrageously distorted, but nevertheless a portrait, of General Wilkinson."<sup>5</sup> Later reviewers made references to the

<sup>1</sup> 8, 123-124 (February, 1810).

<sup>2</sup> 94, 74 (January, 1821).

<sup>3</sup> Pierre Irving: *The Life and Letters of Washington Irving*, New York, 1862, I, 240.

<sup>4</sup> This satire is discussed in the introduction to a forthcoming reprint of the 1809 edition of the *History*, edited by S. T. Williams and the present writer. Edwin Greenlaw has written on Irving's treatment of Jefferson in *The Texas Review*, I, 291-306 (April, 1916).

<sup>5</sup> *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 17, 62.

political satire in the *History*,<sup>6</sup> but no one appears to have again mentioned James Wilkinson. As John Neal was an ultra-romantic both as novelist and critic, given to exaggeration and sensationalism, his identification of the Dutch general cannot now be accepted without demonstration.

Jacobus Von Poffenburgh is, as his name suggests, a character not to be found in the annals of the New Netherlands. James Wilkinson, however, was a prominent figure during the early decades of the American republic. Born in 1757, he served as an officer in the American army during the Revolution, was for a time in business in Kentucky, and later returned to the army, of which he was given supreme command in 1796. Known as a one-time intimate of Benedict Arnold and suspected of being a pensioner of the King of Spain, this former correspondent and supposed ally of Aaron Burr amazed the United States in 1806 by accusing Burr of treason. A prominent figure at Burr's trial, he was not brought before the courts in his own defence until after the publication of the *History of New York*. Washington Irving as a Federalist was politically unsympathetic with Wilkinson, as with President Jefferson; when the latter became so involved in the Burr affair that his reputation appeared to depend on Wilkinson's vindication, the Federalist party was venomous in its attack upon the General. Further, Irving was moved by personal interest in Aaron Burr.<sup>7</sup> Having been sent by a New York Federalist to aid in the defence of Burr at Richmond in 1807, he wrote concerning his client, "I feel no sensation remaining but compassion for him,"<sup>8</sup> and again, "his situation is such as should appeal to the feelings of every generous bosom."<sup>9</sup> Similarly, he was much moved by his last sight of Burr in the Virginia peni-

<sup>6</sup> E. g.: *The Port Folio*, 19, 437 (May, 1825); *The Quarterly Review*, 31, 473 (March, 1825); *Frazer's Magazine*, 44, 13 (July, 1850).

<sup>7</sup> There appears to be little evidence to support the assertion of Henry Adams that Irving was politically a Burr-ite (*A History of the United States*, New York, 1889-91, ix, 210). Irving stated in 1804 that he was "an admirer of General Hamilton, and a partisan with him in politics" (Pierre Irving: *op. cit.*, i, 91), and in 1807 he wrote of Burr that he was "opposed to him in political principles" (*Ibid.*, i, 191).

<sup>8</sup> i, 191.

<sup>9</sup> i, 201.

tentiary.<sup>10</sup> Finally, Irving, as might be expected, took an instinctive dislike to James Wilkinson when he saw the latter at the trial of Burr; expressions of this antipathy are quoted below. These facts make it clear that Irving was possessed of sufficient information to draw a sketch of Wilkinson with some exactness, and sufficient animus to make the portrait bitingly satirical.

Turning to the *History of New York*, the reader finds that Irving's General Von Poffenburgh was "a huge, full bodied man"; that his ruddy face "glowed like a fiery furnace"; and that therein shone "a pair of large glassy blinking eyes, which projected like those of a lobster."<sup>11</sup> That James Wilkinson was thus portly is stated by Parton;<sup>12</sup> Wendell and Minnigerode call him obese;<sup>13</sup> and Lewis terms him "paunchy, gross," with "a red, sweat-distilling face."<sup>14</sup> These details are verified by C. W. Peale's portrait of Wilkinson<sup>15</sup> and by the crayon drawing by James Sharpless in Independence Hall, Philadelphia.<sup>16</sup> Von Poffenburgh, according to Irving, wore a coat "crossed and slashed, and carbonadoed, with stripes of copper lace, and swathed round the body with a crimson sash, of the size and texture of a fishing net."<sup>17</sup> His portraits show that Wilkinson equally loved display in dress, and his coat is said by Lewis to have shown "an exuberance of epaulette and an extravagance of gold braid that speak of tastes for coarse glitter."<sup>18</sup> This same delight in display is mentioned by Wendell and Minnigerode.<sup>19</sup> Externally, therefore, the two generals have much in common.

Von Poffenburgh's bearing and personality were in accord with his appearance: in New Amsterdam "he strutted about," a "bitter looking . . . man of war";<sup>20</sup> in the South, he "swelled" and frequently "would he . . . strut . . . like a vain glorious cock pidgeon."<sup>21</sup> Irving had previously written in much the same

<sup>10</sup> I, 202-203.

<sup>11</sup> New York, 1809, II, 59-60.

<sup>12</sup> *The Life and Times of Aaron Burr*, New York, 1874, II, 32.

<sup>13</sup> *Aaron Burr*, New York, 1925, II, 194.

<sup>14</sup> *An American Patrician*, New York, 1908, p. 233.

<sup>15</sup> Reproduced in Wendell and Minnigerode, opp. II, 11.

<sup>16</sup> Reproduced in Lewis, opp. p. 234.

<sup>17</sup> II, 59.

<sup>18</sup> II, 194.

<sup>21</sup> II, 63.

<sup>18</sup> p. 233.

<sup>20</sup> II, 60.

words of Wilkinson; at Richmond "he strutted into court" and there moved about "swelling like a turkey cock."<sup>22</sup> Von Poffenburgh was exceedingly pompous; he was "completely inflated with his own importance" and he filled his position with "great importance, always styling himself 'commander in chief of the armies of the New Netherlands.'"<sup>23</sup> James Wilkinson made his similar self-importance clear in his *Memoirs* (1816), where he termed himself "commander in chief of the military forces of the United States in the Southwest." Naturally, the Dutchman was very "windy," resembling "one of those puffed up bags" which Eolus gave "that vagabond warrior Ulysses."<sup>24</sup> Irving had in 1807 described Wilkinson as burdened with "a mighty mass of words to deliver himself of" and as wearisome through his verbosity.<sup>24</sup> Henry Adams,<sup>25</sup> as well as Wendell and Minnigerode,<sup>26</sup> also testify to his wild talk, noise, and grandiloquence. Finally, an ironical reference to Von Poffenburgh's "magnanimous soul"<sup>27</sup> is reminiscent of Irving's allusion in his letters to "the magnanimous Wilkinson."<sup>28</sup> Here, then, the parallel between the two generals continues.

Irving's favorite figure in presenting the Dutchman's appearance and character is to liken him to brass; "his dress comported with his character, for he had almost as much brass and copper without, as nature had stored away within."<sup>29</sup> It is in this connection that Von Poffenburgh's relations with the Dutch governor are recounted; "he contrives to pass off all his brass and copper upon Wilhelmus Kieft, who was no judge of base coin, as pure and genuine gold."<sup>30</sup> This may be taken as a satirical reference to the credence given by Thomas Jefferson to the charges made by Wilkinson and the support which the President extended to him during and after the Burr trial, an attitude which aroused extreme bitterness against Jefferson<sup>31</sup> and won him some contempt even among his partisan supporters.

<sup>22</sup> Pierre Irving, I, 195.

<sup>23</sup> II, 59.

<sup>24</sup> Pierre Irving, I, 194.

<sup>25</sup> III, 323.

<sup>26</sup> II, 194.

<sup>27</sup> II, 60.

<sup>28</sup> I, 191.

<sup>29</sup> II, 58, 59.

<sup>30</sup> II, 58.

<sup>31</sup> Henry Adams, III, 456-469, 471; Wendell and Minnigerode, II, 194-195.

The career of Von Poffenburgh reached its climax in an expedition against the Swedes on "the southern frontier" during the administration of Stuyvesant. A previous account of these Swedes makes it clear that Irving is satirizing the inhabitants of the Southern United States in the early nineteenth century. When he states that these folk "lived on hoe cakes and bacon, drank mint juleps and brandy toddy" and indulged in "cock fighting, horse racing, slave driving, tavern haunting, sabbath breaking, mulatto breeding,"<sup>32</sup> he describes not early colonists on the Delaware river but Southerners of the Jeffersonian era as they appeared to complacent Northerners.<sup>33</sup> Again, in referring to "a gigantic, gunpowder race of men . . . exceedingly expert in boxing, biting, gouging, tar and feathering,"<sup>34</sup> he describes frontiersmen of Kentucky and the Southwest, not Peter Stuyvesant's neighbors. Von Poffenburgh's campaign therefore corresponds with Wilkinson's activities in the South in 1806, in which satire Irving departs from colonial history in giving the command of the expedition to the imaginary Von Poffenburgh, when it was in reality directed by Stuyvesant himself. The Dutch general, Irving writes, "conducted his army undauntedly to the southern frontier; through wild lands and savage deserts; over insurmountable mountains, across impassable floods and through impenetrable forests; subduing a vast tract of uninhabited country, and overturning, discomfiting and making incredible slaughter of certain hostile hosts of grass-hoppers, toads and pismires."<sup>35</sup> The Dutch expedition against the Swedes in 1656 which Irving purports to recount was made almost wholly by sea; the passage in reality burlesques General Wilkinson's version of his march to New Orleans, of which he boasts in his *Memoirs*. The event was in 1809 still in the public eye, as was shown a few days after the publication of the Knickerbocker *History* by an ironical allusion in a New York newspaper to Wilkinson's journey "to New Orleans upon a very celebrated occasion, 'by forced marches.'" <sup>36</sup> Arrived at his destination, the Dutch general built

<sup>32</sup> I, 232-233.

<sup>33</sup> For a parallel, see Royal Tyler: *The Algerine Captive* (1797), Hartford, 1816, pp. 30-36.

<sup>34</sup> I, 232.

<sup>35</sup> II, 62.

<sup>36</sup> *The New York Herald*, December 16, 1809.

"a redoubtable redoubt, named Fort Casimer" which fortress was "the original germ of the present flourishing town of New Castle."<sup>37</sup> The fort (located in what is now Delaware) was in fact captured by Stuyvesant,<sup>38</sup> rather than by one of his generals. The incident, thus altered, resembles Wilkinson's conduct on reaching New Orleans, where he made noisy efforts on behalf of the national defence. His fortification of the city, arbitrary exercise of military law, and grandiloquent proclamations threw the whole region in an uproar, but it was found, when the excitement subsided, that Wilkinson had absurdly exaggerated the dangers of the situation. In military achievements, as in appearance and character, the two generals, it seems, correspond.

Irving further states of his general that rumor intimated he had in reality a treacherous understanding with the Swedish commander; that he had long been in the practice of privately communicating with the Swedes, together with divers hints about "secret service money."<sup>39</sup> Not until some time after the publication of the Knickerbocker *History* was it officially established that Wilkinson was in the pay of Spain while commanding the American army, but the accusation was often made by Burr's friends. It appears that Irving here refers to this suspicion concerning Wilkinson's integrity.

The point which completes and makes inescapable the identification of Von Poffenburgh as Wilkinson is the apparently farcical incident of the queues. "The general," says Irving, "in an evil hour, issued orders for cropping the hair of both officers and men"<sup>40</sup> among the Dutch troops. The order was unwelcome, and one Kildermeester, a veteran campaigner, was particularly violent in his opposition, being ardently devoted to his "immoderate queue." The wrangle occupies some two pages<sup>41</sup> and is ended only by Kildermeester's opportune death. Queues were in actuality unknown in the New Amsterdam of Stuyvesant, nor did they appear until several decades thereafter. They were worn, however, by soldiers in the early American army, and it was James Wilkinson who in 1801 ordered that in the

<sup>37</sup> II, 62.

<sup>38</sup> Van Rensselaer: *History of the City of New York*, New York, 1909, I, 367.

<sup>39</sup> II, 109.

<sup>40</sup> II, 65.

<sup>41</sup> II, 65-67.

United States army, the men's hair should be cut short. H. L. Nelson in *The Army of the United States* states that, as might be expected, "this innovation was for a long time resisted."<sup>42</sup> It is evident that Irving alludes to this incident.

The close resemblance between the imaginary Von Poffenburgh and the actual Wilkinson in face, form, and dress; their similarity in bearing and character; the relation of each to his superior; the parallel between the military exploits of the two; the fact that each is charged with being in pay of the enemy; and the anachronistic introduction of the queue episode, supported by two other significant violations of historical accuracy in the transformation of colonial Swedes into Southerners and the capture of Fort Casimer by a non-existent general, combine to vindicate John Neal in his assertion that Von Poffenburgh is a sketch of James Wilkinson. Neal appears to have erred elsewhere in commenting on the secondary satirical significance of the Knickerbocker *History*, but here it must be admitted that he is correct. It should be observed also that in this portrait Irving permits himself an unusual degree of asperity. Henry Adams justly says of the general tone of Irving's comment on his contemporaries that "its most marked trait was the good-nature which, at a time when bitterness was universal in politics, saved Irving's satire from malignity."<sup>43</sup> In dealing with James Wilkinson, however, Irving exercises only to a limited degree what Adams terms his "power of deadening venom by a mere trick of hand." The portrait is therefore unique among the satirical allusions to contemporary politics in the *History* in its caustic ridicule, although its victim was a man whom few today will venture to defend against Irving's strictures.

GEORGE TREMAINE McDOWELL.

*Yale University.*

---

<sup>42</sup> New York, n. d., n. p.

<sup>43</sup> IX, 210.

## HELLENIC AND BEOWULFIAN SHIELDS AND SPEARS

1. In the *Iliad*, Homer has six instances of the word ἀνρυξ, meaning the rim or border of a shield (ἀσπίς, σάκος), of which the most striking appears in the description of the shield of Achilles (Il. 478-480):

First fashioned he a shield, great and sturdy, adorning it cunningly in every part, and round about it set a bright rim, threefold and glittering.

The other occurrences are these (tr. A. T. Murray):

6. 117-8: the black hide at either end smote against his ankles and his neck, even the rim that ran about the outermost edge of his bossed shield.

14. 412: smote Hector on the chest with a stone over the shield-rim.

15. 645: he tripped upon the rim of the shield that himself bare.

18. 607-8: Therein he set also the great might of the river Oceanus, around the uttermost rim of the strongly wrought shield.

20. 274-5: smote upon Aeneas' shield . . . beneath the outermost rim, where the bronze ran thinnest.

Emphasis upon the outer edge of the shield is found in the expression, ἀσπίς τερμύεσσα, Il. 16. 802, where the adjective is translated by Seymour as *well-rimmed* (*The Homeric Age*, p. 645; cf. p. 161), by Cunliffe as *fringed* (*Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*), by Lang, Leaf, and Myers as *tasseled*, and so by Murray.<sup>1</sup> Here perhaps also belongs λαοσῆιον, a word occurring in Homer only in Il. 5. 453; 12. 426, both translated by Murray "smote the bull's-hide bucklers about one another's breasts, the round shields and fluttering targets." According to him, this "appears to have been (at least originally) nothing more than an undressed hide, the hair of which fluttered about its edges as a fringe—a human counterpart of the fringed, or tasseled, ægis<sup>2</sup> of Zeus."

Of another Greek word, ἵρυς, we are told by Liddell and Scott that, in post-Homeric usage, from meaning rim of the shield, it comes to be used for the shield itself:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Helbig, *Das Homerische Epos*, p. 320: "ein Schild an dem der Rand besonders in die Augen sprang."

<sup>2</sup> Thus described Il. 5. 738-9: "About her shoulders she flung the tasseled ægis, fraught with terror, all about which Rout is set as a crown."



Like *ἀντὺξ*, a circle or rim made of willow (cf. *lrea*): used by Hom. (only in Il.) always of the felloe of a wheel . . . Il. 4. 486, cf. 5.724:—the outer edge or rim of the shield, Hes. Sc. 314, Hdt. 7.89; or the round shield itself, Tyrtae. 11, Eur. Ion 210, Tro. 1197, cf. Xen. An. 4. 7. 12.

If now we turn to the Old English period, we find a similar emphasis upon the border of the shield. According to Miss Keller (*Anglo-Saxon Weapon Names*, p. 69; cf. p. 75), in the Merovingian era, "on the Continent as in England, the chief material used for shields was linden-wood [*lind*], often covered with leather, as among the Romans, with a metal-bound edge to insure greater strength."<sup>3</sup>

Of *lind* there are three instances in *Beowulf* (2341, 2365, 2610), besides six occurrences of compounds: *lindhæbbende* (945, 1402), *-gestealla* (1973), *-plega* (1073, 2032), *-wiga* (2603).

In *lind* there is of course no suggestion of the rim, and the same is the case with *scyld* (*scild*), from which our modern word is derived. This occurs in *Beowulf* five times (325, 333, 437, 2675, 2850), besides the compounds *scyldfreca* (1033), *scildweall* (3118), *scyldwiga* (288).

Another word for shield is *bord*, whose original meaning is border or rim (*NED.*). This is found in *Beowulf* (2259, 2524, 2673), besides the compounds *bordhæbbende* (2895), *-hrēoða* (2203), *-rand* (2559), *-weal* (2980), *-wudu* (1243); *hildebord* (397, 3139), *wigbord* (2339); of which the most singular, because of its duplication, is *bordrand*.

The last of the *Beowulfian* words for shield is *rand* (*rond*). This occurs nine times (231, 326, 656, 682, 1209, 2538, 2566, 2609, 2653), besides the compounds *-hæbbende* (861), *-wiga* (1298, 1793); *bordrand* (2559; see above), *geolorand* (438), *hilderand* (1242), *sīdrand* (1289).

*Rand*, which Kluge (*Etym. Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache*, 5th ed.) considers related to *rim* and *rind*, is by him and the *NED.* regarded as originally meaning *border*, *margin*, *rim*, and hence coming to signify *shield*, though exceptionally it is found,

<sup>3</sup> Contrast this with the statement by Tacitus, writing about A. D. 116 of the campaign of Germanicus against the Germans, a hundred years earlier (*Ann.* 2. 14): "His shield is not strengthened with leather or steel, but is of osiers woven together, or of thin and painted boards."

in both Old English (*Gn. C. 37*) and Old High German, with the sense of *shield-boss*, *umbo*. With the meaning *umbo* it occurs, according to Klaeber, in *Beow. 2673*, though Grein here understands *rim*, the phrase being *bord wið rond[e]*, which Klaeber would translate "the shield [was burned] as far as the boss," while Grein renders "der Schild bis zu dem Rande." But, since Klaeber is willing (Gloss.) to admit, following Miss Keller (p. 73), that *geolorand* (438) may mean "golden band encircling the shield," rather than suggesting the yellow color of the linden-wood (cf. the ON. *Helgakviða Hundingsbana*<sup>4</sup> 1. 33: *rauðum skildi; rond var ór gulli*), it would seem that Grein's rendering should be preferred.<sup>5</sup>

II. The same Homeric word, *μελίη*, which signifies ash-tree (*Il. 13. 178; 16. 767*), is much more frequently employed to denote an ashen spear (*Il. 2.543; 16. 143; 20. 277, 322, 390; 21. 162, 169, 174; 22. 133, 225, 328; Od. 14. 281; 22. 259, 276*). Derived from this noun is the adjective *μέλιος* (*μείλιος*), several times used in the *Iliad* as descriptive of the spear (5. 655, etc.); and another such adjective, *ἐνυμελίης*, with goodly spear of ash (*Il. 4. 47, 165; 6. 449; 17. 9, 23, 59; Od. 3. 400*). Similarly, the

<sup>4</sup> This poem, according to Bugge, was composed in England, about the year 1000, and this view is confirmed by Boer (*Die Edda* 2. 135); cf. Magnússon and Morris, *Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs*, p. 29: "Then up stands Sinfjotli, with a helm on his head, bright shining as glass, and a byrny as white as snow; a spear in his hand, and thereon a banner of renown, and a gold-rimmed shield hanging before him." See also Falk, *Altnordische Waffenkunde*, pp. 140, 143; the *fætte scyldas* (gold-plated shields) of *Beow. 333*; and Keller, p. 15. In Old Norse, both meanings of *rond* were current, *rim* and *shield*.

<sup>5</sup> There is a poetic word, *lærig*, in post-Beowulfian use, one instance occurring in *By. 284*, which Sedgefield defines as *rim* (of *shield*), where the hemistich is "bærst bordes lærig," and the other in *Ewod. 239*, which Blackburn renders *edge*, *rim*, in the hemistich "ofer linde lærig." Grein (*Sprachschatz*) has: "margo clypei? (vgl. *λαίστιον*, . . .) wie *rand* sowol *margo clypei* als *clypeus* ist. . . . Nach M. Rieger soll es den Körper des Schildes bezeichnen."

In two charters, one of 997 and one of 1015, or thereabouts, we find the word *targa* (Mod. Eng. *targe*), probably taken over from the Old Norse *targa*, which is found about half a century earlier. *Targa* means *shield*, and is akin to the Old High German *zarga*, which means *edging*, *border*.

Old English word for ash-tree, *æsc*, means spear<sup>o</sup> in *Beow.* 1772, as<sup>1</sup> does *æscholt*, ash-wood, in 330, while *æscwiga*, 2042, means spear-warrior.

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

*Yale University.*

---

## ELIZABETHAN PLAYERS AS TRADESFOLK

In an article on "John Kirke, the Caroline Actor-Dramatist" contributed to *Studies in Philology* for October, 1924, while discussing the possibility that Kirke had ended his days as a London merchant, I took occasion to write:

Even in the days before the Civil War old Heminges, on his retirement from the stage, went into the grocery business; and earlier still, Martin Slater diversified his work as an actor by conducting an ironmongery.

This statement Mr. T. W. Baldwin has thought fit to traverse. In a note on "Nathaniel Field and Robert Wilson" published in *M. L. N.* for January, 1926, he says:

Of course, one frequently never exercised the trade to which one was eligible. For instance, Mr. W. J. Lawrence, in a recent article infers that because John Heminges was a grocer and Martin Slaughter an ironmonger, they must needs at some time have exercised those trades. We need only record that King James himself is said to have been a grocer, and then let him who will follow Mr. Lawrence's analogy.

I should have little respect for the scholar who followed Mr. Baldwin's alternative analogy. It is a delicious *non sequitur*. Nothing more in substantiation of my case is necessary than a plain statement of the facts on which I based it. But perhaps it is requisite, first of all, to emphasize a point which most understanding folk will deem a truism, viz., that descriptions of individuals in legal documents are, and always have been, purely for identification, and deal only with immediate status or occupation. Now, as it hap

<sup>o</sup> Cf. Shakespeare, *Cor.* 4. 5. 112-5:

Let me twine

Mine arms about that body, where against  
My grained *ash* an hundred times hath broke,  
And scarr'd the moon with splinters.

pened, in writing the impugned passage I based solely on legal documents. It is remarkable that while most of the notable actors of Heminges' time—Burbage, Condell, and Underwood as examples—described themselves in their wills by the proud title of "gentlemen," Heminge, in making his in 1630, was content with humbler claim. He was no more than "citizen and grocer of London." This is an astonishing description if the retired old actor was, as Mr. Baldwin insinuates, simply an honorary freeman of the Grocers' Company. And, in that case, one is forced to ask oneself why he deviated from the normal routine.

As for Martin Slater, perhaps Mr. Baldwin will be good enough to explain away the description given of him in the articles of agreement between the Whitefriars Theatre sharers drawn up in 1608, and first published by James Greenstreet in the New Shakespeare Society's *Transactions* for 1887-1892, pp. 269 ff. If Slater was merely a nominal ironmonger, why the odious distinction made in describing him in the preamble of the articles, a distinction, to my mind, all the more significant from the fact that amongst the sharers included in the designation of "gentlemen" were two traders, George Androwes, and William Trevell? Here is the preamble:

Articles of agreement indented made the tenth daye of Marche, Anno Domini 1607, and in the fiveth yeare of the raigne of our soveraigne lord Kinge James of England, ffraunce and Ireland, Defendour of the faithe &c., and of Scotland the one and fortieth, Betweene Martyn Slatyar, cittizen and ironmonger, of thone partie, and Lordinge Barry, George Androwes, Michaell Drayton, Willyam Trevell, William Cooke, Edward Sibthorpe, and John Mason of the cittie of London, gentlemen, on thother partie, viz.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

Dublin.

---

## DANTE NOTES

### VIII. THREE GUIDOS?

In *Purgatorio*, XI, 94 sqq., Oderisi of Gubbio, the once famous illuminator of manuscripts, after speaking of the fall of his own pride of achievement before the fame of a greater successor, cites further illustrative cases from artists and from poets who were contemporaries of himself and of Dante. Concerning two of the

former who were both living at the date of the Vision—and therefore, at the time he is represented as speaking—Oderisi says: “Cimabue thought to hold the field in painting, and now Giotto has the cry (the applause of the populace: *il grido*), so that the former’s fame is dim.” Thereupon he adds:

Così ha tolto l’uno a l’altro Guido  
la gloria de la lingua; e forse è nato  
chi l’uno e l’altro caccerrà del nido. (lines 97-9)

The enormous amount of discussion to which these three lines have given rise has failed to settle their exegesis; this fact is in itself, of course, far from strange or unusual; but, inasmuch as none of the two or three, among the many, explanations which have established a right to serious consideration can be accepted as decisive, I beg leave to suggest another, which I feel to have both argumentative and esthetic justification for a claim to being placed fairly on a par with the two or three more commonly discussed explanations.

First of all, setting aside sporadic attempts to identify “l’uno” or “l’altro Guido” with obscure or irrelevant Guidos of various degrees,<sup>1</sup> the majority of commentators insist that we must understand Guido Cavalcanti as the one who has superseded Guido Guinizelli; and a small but far from negligible minority, who seem to have more closely followed the criterion of “explaining Dante by Dante,” periodically reaffirm with dogged persistence Philalethes’ conviction that the two meant are Guido Guinizelli superseding Guittone d’Arezzo;<sup>2</sup> while both parties leave us to elect Dante himself, or else some undefined person or persons, as destined to “chase both from the nest.”<sup>3</sup>

The attempt of the majority to put aside Guittone d’Arezzo as a possibility for the first Guido is in dissonance with the very em-

<sup>1</sup> Guido Novello da Polenta and Guido delle Colonne, especially.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., G. Maruffi, *Una questione abbandonata*, Benevento, 1901; reviewed by A. Fiammazzo, in *Bull.*, VIII, 330 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> F. C. Pellegrini’s interesting suggestion, in *Rassegna bibliografica della lett. ital.*, IX (1901), 23-6, that Dante meant that both Giotto and the triumphant Guido were due to be ousted by successors, met with little favor—notably at the hands of no less an authority than D’Ovidio (*Studi sulla Commedia*, 567 sqq.)—but it is perfectly satisfactory, for all that; and it may be what Dante meant.

phatic words which Dante makes Guinizelli himself say about the Aretine in *Purg.*, XXVI, 121-6; and secondly, Maruffi<sup>4</sup> among others is perfectly right in insisting that Dante's repeatedly expressed and profound admiration for Guinizelli makes it very unlikely that the latter is meant by the eclipsed "altro Guido."

My suggestion of a further alternative is as follows: 'The fame of Guido Guinizelli has superseded that of Guittone d'Arezzo, and perhaps there is now living a *third Guido*—Guido Cavalcanti—who will cause them both to be forgotten.' Doubtless this free, but quite natural, understanding of the exact tenses could be riddled to pieces and scorned to oblivion by intransigent critics; as Pellegrini<sup>5</sup> thinks to put the quietus once for all on those who would see Guinizelli in the "un Guido" when he points out that "l'un Guido *ha tolto*—non già *tolse*. . . ." But, in that other so significant passage, in *Purg.* XXVI, Guinizelli is evidently referring to the contemporary recognition of his own work over Guittone's when he uses the very same tense in "*l'ha vinto il ver*"; a consideration of the preceding context, especially lines 97-9 and 112-14, can hardly lead to any other conclusion. The "uno . . . Guido" does not have to be alive in the flesh in the year 1300 for Oderisi to say of him that he "*ha tolto* . . . la gloria della lingua" from the other Guido. The tenses are in relation to the *logical* subject, which is in each case the *reputation* involved. In no way is this last fact—along with some others—so clearly brought out as by the "deadly parallel"; and remember that Dante himself must have had the passage in *Purg.*, XI, constantly before him while writing the later one:

*Purg.*, XI, 91 sqq.:

(Oderisi of Gubbio speaking:)

Oh vana gloria de l'umane posse!  
com poco verde in su la cima dura,  
se non è giunta da l'etati grosse!  
Credette Cimabue ne la pintura

*Purg.*, XXVI, 118 sqq.:

(Guido Guinizelli speaking—at  
first of Arnaut Daniel:)

Versi d'amore e prose di romanzi  
soverchiò tutti; e lascia dir li stolti  
che quel di Lemosi credon ch'avanzi.  
A voce più ch'al ver drizzan li volti,  
e così ferman sua oppinione  
prima ch'arte o racion per lor  
s'ascolti.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*

*Purg.*, XI, 91 sqq.:

tener lo campo, e ora ha Giotto il  
*grido*,  
 sì che la fama di colui è secura.  
 Così *ha tolto* l'uno a l'altro Guido  
 la gloria de la lingua; e forse è nato  
 chi l'uno e l'altro cacerà del nido.

*Purg.*, XXVI, 118 sqq.:

Così fer molti antichi di Guittone,  
 di *grido* in *grido* pur lui dando  
 pregio,  
 fin che l'*ha vinto* il ver con più  
 persone.

The *così* of *Purg.*, XI, 97, connects directly with *grido* two lines above, and from that is the direct bridge to the *grido* upon *grido* that misguided partisans formerly awarded to Guittone. The fact that it is reputation, or rather the stubbornness of ignorant partisans who refuse to be convinced that their favorites have lost reputation with competent critics, which moves Dante to the expression of his irritation in both these extracts, makes the echo of *De Vulg. El.*, II, vi, 8, seem more than a mere possibility: "Subsistant igitur ignorantiae sectatores Guittonem Aretinum et quosdam alios extollentes, nunquam in vocabulis atque constructione plebescere desuetos!" Taken in conjunction with the fact that, of all the Guidos mentioned in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (Guittone d'Arezzo, Guido Guinizelli, Guido Cavalcanti, Guido Ghisilieri da Bologna, Guido Giudice dalle Colonne da Messina) Guittone is the only one of whom Dante expresses disapproval, and at the same time the only one whom he mentions as having partisans, this parallel would seem calculated to give the majority of modern commentators cause for revision of their dictum.<sup>6</sup>

The *terzina* of *Purg.*, XI, 91-3, has special aptness if understood as another of Dante's indignant allusions to the circumstance that it was only the ignorant stupidity of the generation immediately following Guittone's literary efforts which allowed him and his partisans so long to remain vainglorious of his attainments, for with this bearing the definite article of "*l'etati grosse*" becomes really definite, and the point is a telling one; and XXVI, 124-6, describes the slowness of growth of his great successor's fame against such odds. Even Guinizelli himself called Guittone "*padre mio*"

<sup>6</sup> And this in spite of the new weight of authority they gain from the "Indice analitico dei nomi e delle cose" of the edition of the Società dantesca italiana: there, *s. v.* "Guido Cavalcanti" is the entry, "superò Guido Guinizelli, *Purg.* XI, 97," and *s. v.* "Guido Guinizelli" is, "superato da Guido Cavalcanti, *Purg.* XI, 97"!)

and followed him for some time before breaking away from the conventionalizing school.

Irrespective, therefore, of the specific point of this article, it is my own conviction that Guittone is meant by "l' altro Guido." My original purpose, however, was not to re-argue the case for "l' altro Guido = Guittone d'Arezzo." It was, as I have above stated, to suggest to those who accept that view the possibility that by the "forse è nato" Dante meant that in the field of Italian lyric, which he himself had abandoned for "higher flights,"<sup>7</sup> both old Guittone, whom he despised, and Guido Guinizelli, the philosophizing master of the Dolce Stil Nuovo, whom he respected, might be forgotten when the public came to recognize the worth of his beloved friend Guido Cavalcanti. The "forse è nato" applies equally well to Cavalcanti as to Dante, whom most commentators have elected for this position; and when we look ahead at *terzina* 103-5, with its reproof to pride emphasized by the stressed pronouns *tu* and *te*<sup>8</sup> addressed directly to Dante (contrast the *vostra* of line 115), and see Dante accept the reproof in line 119,<sup>9</sup> it seems clear that either he meant no particular person by the "forse è nato," or else that he meant some one other than himself.

If then another definite poet is meant, why not Guido Cavalcanti? Besides the material reasons for this possibility which have been developed, partly explicitly and partly implicitly, during the progress of the preceding discussion, there are a couple of little items of verbal evidence which may be of some weight in the sum total.

First, to refer to Guittone as a "Guido," Dante had to take a slight liberty with his name—though we know this liberty to be justified;<sup>10</sup> in the Latin form, in the MSS. of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, we find both Guitto(n. . .) and Guido(n. . .)—and this very straining may be an evidence that Dante was making a special effort to get a triad of Guidos, quite a characteristic proceeding on his part; compare the three Carlos of *Purg.* XX, 67, 71, and 79.

<sup>7</sup> See *Inf.*, IV, 95-102.

<sup>8</sup> "Che voce avrai tu più, se vecchia scindi / da te la carne. . . ?"

<sup>9</sup> ". . . gran tumor m'appiani."

<sup>10</sup> See B. Bianchi, *La declinazione nei nomi di luogo della Toscana*, in *Arch. glott. ital.*, x, 393.



Again, the first, and the only other, time Guido Cavalcanti is brought into the *Divine Comedy*, in *Inferno*, X, the laconic reference to him is introduced by the same cryptic word "forse." It is a tempting field for speculation as to just what were Dante's emotions, and what were his judgments, regarding this close friend of his young manhood, whom Dante was officially involved in exiling just before the time set for the Vision, and who died in that exile only a few weeks after that date, full of fame and of promise, but apparently unreverent of those authorities—classical and ecclesiastical—which to Dante were of so much inspiration and sanctity, and doubtless of so much promise of fame for the present world and of salvation for the next. And this ferment and flow of contrasting bitter and sweet reminiscences must have been particularly turbid and disturbing in those midway years of Dante's own exile while he was writing the *Inferno* and the *Purgatorio*, and the "ponderous theme that weighed upon his mortal shoulders" <sup>11</sup> was being carried on over hard paths while mere scholarly treatises in Schoolmen's Latin, such as the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, were abandoned unfinished by the wayside.

And in any case, when we recall that Dante speaks of Guinizelli as

. . . il padre  
mio e de li altri miei miglior che mai  
rime d'amore usar dolci e leggiadre (*Purg.*, xxvi, 97-9) <sup>12</sup>

how can we imagine that he meant himself as the one who "perhaps would oust" both Guinizelli and some other, or any other, Guido from their fame? Guinizelli's renown was in the lyric, and Dante expressly admits that others better than himself were Guinizelli's successors in that "nest." Now that Dante had abandoned the lyric genre, what more natural than that he should entertain a hope—waving though it might be—that poor Guido Cavalcanti's worth and influence might prevail there, though otherwise his life would seem to have left no more trace than "fummo in aere ed in acqua la schiuma?" <sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *Par.*, xxiii, 64-5.

<sup>12</sup> Note the line-numbers: another "coincidence"?

<sup>13</sup> *Inf.*, xxiv, 51.

In truth I can see no real alternatives other than these two: either Dante has no definite poet in mind, or else it is Guido Cavalcanti who is destined to supplant both Guido Guinizelli and Guittone d'Arezzo.

HERBERT D. AUSTIN.

*University of Southern California.*

## SOME OLD NORSE ETYMOLOGIES

### 1. *Bostl* 'arrow'

*Bostl*<sup>1</sup> fem. < *bast* 'string' + *-ul-*, i. e. 'something put onto or thrown from a string' = 'arrow'; cf. Greek *τόξον* 'bow': *τοξέω* 'shoot with a bow,' *τόξευμα* 'that which is shot from a bow' = 'arrow.'

### 2. *Elgja* 'to belch'

*Elg-ja* is a denominative *jôn*-verb derived from the adjective *elig-r* 'filthy' (i. e. *\*elig-ja* > *elg-ja*); association with the adjective prevented the *j*-umlaut of the radical vowel *-e-* (i. e. *elg-ja* > *\*ilg-ja*).

The primary sense of the verb *elgja* was 'to be filthy,' hence 'to belch filth' > 'to belch.'

The fundamental root is Germanic *\*al-* 'filth' (cf. Fick, *Vergl. Etym. Wtb. der indo-germ. Sprachen*<sup>4</sup>, 21 sub *alk*); *\*al-ig-az* > ON. *el-igr* 'filthy.'

### 3. *Flagð* 'giantess, ogre'

I venture to connect *flagð* neut. with the root *\*flag-* 'loose.' From the root *\*flag-* we have ON. *flag* 'spot where the turf has been cut out,' *flaga* 'a flag of stone or of turf,' *flag-brjóska* 'the cartilage (lit. 'loose part') of the breast-bone,' *flag-spilda* 'a slice, cut,' *flag-na* 'to flake off, slough off,' etc. (cf. Falk and Torp,<sup>2</sup> *Norw.-Dän. Etym. Wtb.* I, 231 sub *flage* II).

<sup>1</sup> Egilsson (*Lew. Poet.*) gives the form of this word as *bøsl*: *bøslar* plur., but the form *bøsl* could represent an earlier *bøs-t-l*, the *-t-* disappearing between two consonants (cf. Noreen, *Aisl. Grm.*<sup>4</sup>, § 291, 11).

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter abbreviated to FT.

From this fundamental idea of 'loose' we have the derived sense of 'a loose person' > 'imposter' in ON. *flag-ari*. I believe that this sense of 'morally loose,' 'bad' was originally present in the word *flagð*, i. e. 'a loose woman' > 'deceitful woman' > 'demon, giantess'; cf. Gothic *un-hulþô* 'unfriendly, hostile woman' > 'demon.'

I identify the -ð in *flag-ð* with the *þ*-suffix denoting female persons (cf. F. Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, § 43), as in Gothic *maga-þ-s*: OE. *mæge-ð*. Only the gender (neuter) of *flag-ð* offers difficulty—one might expect the word to be feminine—(cf. *\*flagð-ô* > *\*flogð*). But names of monsters were often neuter (cf. *troll*, *gálkn*, etc.) and the word *flagð*, tho applied to a woman, may have derived its gender by analogy with these words; cf. *flagð-kona* where *flagð* apparently has no sense of sex, exactly as in the case of *troll*- in *troll-kona*.

#### 4. *Gáll* 'gaiety'

From the root ON. *gál*- we have also *gál-i* 'a wag,' *gál-ask* 'to make jokes' and *gál-a* 'a lively girl.'

I connect ON. *gál*- with PG. *\*gail*-, Goth. *gail-jan* 'to rejoice,' OHG. *geil*, OS. *gêl*, OE. *gâl* 'joyful, insolent.' For the ablaut variation *\*â: \*ai* compare ON. *grápa* 'to rob, pilfer': *greip* 'a grip.'

#### 5. *Got* 'spawn': *gota* 'spawning'

*Got* < *\*gut-a* from the same root as *gjóta*, *gaut*: *gutum*, *gotinn* 'to flow'; *got* means then 'that which has flowed or dropped from the fish' = 'egg,' 'spawn.'

#### 6. *Hjúka* 'to nurse, cherish'

*Hjúka* < *hjú* 'family, household' + *-ka* 'to do household duties' > 'to be dutiful' > 'to nurse, care for, cherish.'

The proper name *Hjúki* (mythical name for the man in the moon) probably does not belong here but to *húka*: *hokinn* 'to bend, hook'; *Hjúki* = 'the man bent over, the crooked one'?

#### 7. *Húski* 'a niggard'

*Húski* < *hús* 'house' + the diminutive suffix *-ki* (*\*-kan*) = 'house-servant' > 'mean, stingy person.' The diminutive suffix *-k*.

is in keeping with the belittling sense which the word acquired. No doubt the word *hús-ki* was associated with *hús-karl*, and in that case it could be felt as a diminutive of *hús-karl*, cf. *gríð-ka* as a diminutive of *gríð-kona* 'house-wife,' (*Grettiss.* 75, 8, Boer's edition, An. Sagabibliothek).

The degeneracy of meaning connected with the word for 'servant' is common to all languages; cf. Eng. *villain*, *churl*, etc., ON. *skállkr*, Germ. *Schallk*. ON. *hýski* (OHG.-OS. *hūwiski*) 'family, household' came later to mean 'beggars, low people,' cf. *hyskinn* 'slothful.'

#### 8. *Krakki*, 'a thin youth, urchin'

*Krakki* < *krak-* (cf. *kraki* 'stake, pole') + the diminutive suffix *-ki* (\**-kan*) = 'little pole' > 'thin boy' > 'boy.'

For the semantic development of 'stick, pole, peg' etc. > 'boy' or 'girl' compare Norw. *píke* 'girl' (FT. II, 824 sub *pige*), Dan. *dreng* 'boy' (FT. I, 154 sub *dreng*), Dan. *pog*, Swed. *påk* 'a small boy' (FT. II, 841 sub *pog*), Norw. *plugg* 'fat little boy' (FT. II, 839 sub *plugg*).

To this list many more examples could be added. I add here (omitted by FT.) *krakki* (given above) and ON. *pollr* (Eng. *thole*) 'a wooden peg' as used in the kennings for 'man, warrior,' cf. *hjálm-, seim-, hring-pollr*.

#### 9. *Mauk* 'jelly'

*Mauk* belongs (with ablaut variation) to the same root as *mjúkr* 'soft' but it is not recorded by FT. I, 744 sub *myg* 'soft.' *Mauk* = 'soft food,' i. e. 'food cooked into a gruel-like mess'; cf. *saup* 'buttermilk': *súpr* 'a drink.'

#### 10. *Mella* 'a giantess'

*Mella* < \**mellôn* which belongs to the same root as \**mellô* (< \**melnô*) > ON. *mjöll* 'fine, loosened snow,' cf. Swed. (dial.) *mjälla* 'fine, sandy earth.'

The root \**mel-* is related to \**mal-* 'grind,' ON. *mala* (cf. FT. I, 712 sub *melrakke* and Fick, 314 sub *mellô*).

As applied to things the word *mella* has the sense of 'noose, trigger,' etc. The semantic development is 'something ground off' > 'something loosened' > 'a loose string' > 'noose, trigger,' etc.

From the noun *mella*, used in this sense, is derived the verb *mella* (used only in scaldic poetry, cf. Egilsson, *Lex. Poet.*, (401) 'to lock (with a *mella* = a small loose object, pin, peg, bolt, etc.).'

*Mella* 'a giantess' I regard as the same word as *mella* 'a noose'; the semantic development is parallel to that of *flagð* 'giantess' (cf. no. 3), namely, 'a loose woman' > 'bad woman' > 'giantess.'

#### 11. *Drykkju-rútr* 'a drunkard?'

The word *rútr* (not listed by Fritzner, 1866) is found only in the compound *drykkju-rútr* which Cleasby-Vigfússon translate by 'a drunkard.'

I do not believe that *drykkju-rútr* means 'a drunkard' but 'a person boisterous from drink, uproarously drunk'; *-rútr* 'one who roars,' 'noisy, boisterous person,' nomen agentis to *rjóta*, *raut: rutum*, *rotinn* 'to roar' (used primarily of animals). With this same root we may perhaps connect *rytr* 'a sea-gull,' i. e. 'the noisy bird.'

#### 12. *Sinkill* 'a clasp'

*Sinkill* < *sink-* a loan word from OE. *sinc* (OS. *sink*) 'a treasure' + the diminutive suffix *-il-*; *sinkill* = 'a dear, little treasure, jewel' > 'clasp' (as an ornament).

#### 13. *Skona* 'to serve, attend'

The verb *skona* is probably a loan-word from MLG. *schônen* 'to treat considerately, spare' = NHG. *schonen*. Both the meaning and the form of the verb *skona* (aside from the short *o*—one might expect *skóna*—) favor this assumption.

If ON. *skona* is borrowed from MLG. *schônen* the semantic development is clear, viz. 'to treat considerately' > 'to be polite' (as a host towards a guest) > 'to serve, attend.'

ON. *skona* is not listed by FT. (II, 975) under the head of Norw.-Dan. *skaane* (= Swed. *skona*) 'to spare' which goes back to MLG. *schônen*. But ON. *skona* was no doubt borrowed at a late period when an ON. short (open) *o* was nearer to the MLG. long (open) *o* than was an ON. long (closed) *o*; i. e. the question of quality may have decided the quantity of the ON. vowel. The short *o* in ON. *skona* would naturally become long before a single consonant in the Modern Scandinavian languages.

14. *Skrjá* 'to skulk, cringe'

*Skrjá* < \**skrehan*. The root \**skreh-* signifies 'to dry up, wither' (cf. Fick, 472 sub *skreh*); it is related to \**skrah-ō*: Norw. (dial.) *skraaen* 'dry,' *skraana* (< \**skrah-nōn*) 'to wither,' *skræa* (< \**skrah-jan*) 'to make dry and brittle,' *skræa* fem. 'a dried up, withered person,' etc.

The semantic development of ON. *skrjá* is then 'to dry up, shrivel up' > 'huddle up' > 'cringe, skulk' (like a coward).

15. *Smjaðra* 'to flatter'

*Smjaðra* < \**smep-rôn*. The root \**smep-* is an ablaut variation of \**smaþ-*: \**smat-* (cf. Fick, 526). The fundamental meaning of this group is 'to make a noise, resound,' from which is derived the sense of 'to talk' and with the iterative diminutive suffix *-r-* (ON. *-ra*) 'to indulge in small talk, to chat, gossip'; cf. Norw. (dial.) *smat-ra* 'to resound,' Mid. Eng. *smat-eren* 'to gossip'; MHG. *smet-ern* 'to chat, gossip,' NHG. *schmett-ern* 'to resound.'

The semantic development of ON. *smjaðra* is then 'to indulge in small talk, gossip' > 'flatter'; the suffix *-ra* lending the same iterative and belittling force as the *-er* in Eng. *flatt-er*, *smatt-er-ing* (cf. Dan. *smig-re*, Swed. *smick-ra*, Germ. *schmeich-el-n* 'to flatter').

16. *Svarker* 'a proud, haughty woman'

*Svarker* originally 'a quarrelsome woman,' nomen agentis<sup>3</sup> to the verb *svarka* 'to quarrel, grumble'; *svarka* < *svar* 'answer' + *ka*, lit. 'to answer back' > 'to quarrel.'

The noun *svarker* was probably at first applied to either sex (cf. *bragr* masc. 'best, foremost person'). The word does not occur in the Elder Edda but in scaldic poetry it is used in its original, derogatory sense, i. e. 'a quarrelsome, coarse woman'; cf. Egilsson, *Lex. Poet.*: "kvinde (især om en overmodig men trættekær og grov kvinde)."

<sup>3</sup> With *svarker* (*svarka*) 'a quarreler' compare *-rútr* (*rjóta*) 'a roarer' (cf. no. 11), *þjótr* (*þjóta*) 'a whistler,' *þjóðr* (*þjóða*) 'an inviter,' *-svelgr* (*svelga*) in compounds 'a swallower.'

For nomina agentis of the *a*-declension in Germanic see L. Sütterlin, *Geschichte der Nomina Agentis im Germanischen*, pp. 2-5.

Later the word *svarkr* acquired a laudatory sense, as is shown by such adjectives as *stórlynd* 'magnanimous, high-spirited,' *sjálig* 'beautiful,' etc. with which it was associated: cf. "Hon var *stórlynd* ok *svarkr* mikill" (*Grettiss.*, Boer's edition, 87, 7); "Hón var *svarkr* mikill ok *sjálig* kona" (*Faer. s.*, 233). In this sense the word *svarkr* was often paired with the synonymous, alliterative *svarri*; *svarri* ok *svarkr* (cf. *Sn. Edda* I, 536).

The semantic development of the word *svarkr* is then 'a quarrelsome woman' > 'high-spirited, proud woman' > 'excellent woman.' This development is not surprising when we consider the character of those women who were prominent in the saga feuds (such as Hallgerðr, Guðrun, etc.) and the sacred nature of the *lex talionis*.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

---

## THE ROLLS OF PARLIAMENT AND THE NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY

The *New English Dictionary* is now and again at fault. The Rolls of Parliament, at least, have not been given the attention they merit. Certainly "A Petition from the folk of Mercerye," one of the earliest and therefore one of the most important of the pieces of English writing in the Rolls, has not been thoroughly studied; and the lack of thoroughness in this one instance leads to the suspicion that the other parts of the Rolls may have been given a treatment similarly light. A study of this brief Petition shows that the compilers of the Dictionary have overlooked two rather common idioms and nine different words; these idioms and words are listed in the Dictionary as appearing for the first time at dates much later than 1386, the date of the Petition.

The idioms are:

1) *time out of mind*, 1386, Petition, 21: "And yif in general his false-ness were ayeinsaide, as of us togydre of the Mercerye or othere craftes, or ony conseilte wolde haue taken to ayeinstande it, or, as tyme<sup>1</sup> out of mynde hath be used, wolden companye togydre. . . ."

First appearance in *N. E. D.*: 1480 Coventry Leet Book 460.

---

<sup>1</sup> *tyme* is omitted in the MS. and this may account for the absence of this

2) *drawn and hanged*, 1386, Petition, 23: "the same Nichol sayd . . . that XX. or XXX. of vs were worthy to be drawn and hanged.

First appearance in *N. E. D.*: 1465 *Paston Lett.* no. 99, L. 135.

The words overlooked by the compilers of the Dictionary are:

1) *abettor*: 1386, Petition, 50: "Also we biseche . . . that if any of vs . . . be apeched . . . bi comunyng with othere . . . as wyth Brembre or his abettours . . . that we mowe come in answer to excuse vs."

First appearance (under *abettor* 7.) in *N. E. D.*: 1514 Fitzherbert Just. Pea. (1538) 142.

2) *proclamation*: 1386, Petition, 11: "And in the nyght next after folwyng he did carye grete quantitee of Armure to the Guyldhalle with which . . . were armed on the morwe ayeins his owne proclamacion. . . ."

First appearance<sup>2</sup> in *N. E. D.*: 1420? *Lyd. Assembly of Gods*, 43.

3) *information*, spec. in Eng. Law: 1386, Petition, 25: "He saide also, whan he hadde disclaundred us, which of us wolde yelde hym fals to his Kyng, the Kyng sholde do hym grace, cherise hym, and be good Lorde to hym: and if any of us alle, that wyth Goddes help have and shulle be founden trewe, was so hardy to profre provyng of hymself trewe, anon was comaunded to prisone. . . ."

"Also, we have be comaunded ofttyme, up owre ligeaunce, to unnedeful and unleveful diverse doynges . . . for thaune were such proclamaciouns made that no man ne woman sholde approche owre lige Lorde . . . and many othere comaundementz also, bifore and sithen, bi suggestion and informacion of suche that wolde nought her falsnesse had be knowen to owre lige Lorde."

First appearance<sup>3</sup> in *N. E. D.* (under *information* 5): 1467-8 Rolls of Parlt. v, 633/1.

4) *suggestion*, spec. in Eng. Law: 1386, Petition, 26: "for thaune were such proclamaciouns made . . . and many othere comaundementz also . . . bi suggestion and informacion of suche that wolde nought her falsnesse had be knowen."

---

earlier use of the idiom in the *N. E. D.* Still, Morsbach's reprint of 1888 was, evidently, not consulted, for in this reprint it is pointed out that *tyme* was omitted by mistake as is shown in a comparison with the Anglo-French text: *del temps dount nulle memoire ne court*. It is Morsbach's opinion that, "die Ergänzung von *tyme* ist wohl zweifellos." (*Der Neu-englischen Schriftsprache*, p. 173.)

<sup>2</sup> The earliest date given for the appearance in English of *proclamation* is 1420. Its appearance in French is cited, however, at an earlier date: (1383, Act 7. Rich. II. c. 6: "Que chesun Viscont Dengleterre soit tenuz decy en avant en propre persone de faire proclamacion de mesme lestatut quatre foity lan.")



First appearance in *N. E. D.* (under *suggestion* 4): 1485, Rolls of Parlt. vi, 292/2.

5) *familiarly*, used as an adverb: 1386, Petition, 37: "And lordes by yowre leue owre lyge lordes comaundement . . . is a gret thyng to ben vsed so familerlich with outen nede."

First appearance in *N. E. D.* 1425, Wyntoun Chron. viii, v, 42.

6) *displeasing*, used as a participial adjective: 1386, Petition, 16: "what man, pryve or apert . . . pleyned . . . ayeins any of his wronges . . . were apeched and it were displesyng to hym Nicholus."

First appearance in *N. E. D.* 1401, *Pol. Poems* (Rolls), 11, 17.

7) *indifferent*, meaning unbiased: 1386, Petition, 28: "the whiche comune wronge uses . . . mowe be shewed and wel knowen bi an indifferent judge and mair of owre citee."

First appearance in *N. E. D.* (under *indifferent* 1a): 1387-8 T. Usk. *Test Love* 1, vii (Skeat), L. 34.

8) *complain*, construed with *of*: 1386, Petition, 1: "To the moost noble and worthiest lordes . . . compleynen, if it lyke to yow, the folk of the Mercerye of London . . . of many wronges subtile and also open oppressions."

First appearance in *N. E. D.* (under *complain* 6c): 1584, Powel Lloyd's *Cambria*, 347.

9) *appeach*: 1380, Petition 16: "so that what man, pryve or apert . . . pleyned . . . ayeins any of his wronges . . . were apeched."

The word appears a second time in line 19: "Also if any man . . . approached a lorde . . . anon was apeched that he was false to the counseile of the citee and so to the Kyng."

First appearance<sup>3</sup> in *N. E. D.* (under *appeach* v, 2), 1401, *Pol. Poems*, 11, 46.

The discovery of so many earlier uses of words in one small part of the Rolls of Parliament would seem to indicate that the Rolls had not been read at all. This, however, is not true, as occasional quotations from them testify. From the Petition alone there are quotations for at least seven words: under *unpregnable*, *oppression*, *subtile*, *election*, *peaceable*, *franchise*, *victualler*. But though the Rolls have been read to some extent, they have not been read as carefully as they should have been; and a closer study of them would probably yield very important results.

<sup>3</sup> The first appearance of *appeach* (not construed with *of*) is given as 1401. An earlier appearance is given, however, in which *appeach* is construed with *of*: 1315, Shoreham, 38: Betere hys ffor to apeched be Of more forgefnesse Than wreche."

Stratmann's *Middle English Dictionary* does not even include the Rolls in its list of references. There are, in consequence, at least fifteen words from the Petition alone which do not appear in this standard work: mairaltee, proposed, busshmentz, accidental (adj.), excuse (v.), enterlich (adv.), proclamacion, abettour, familerlich (adv.), displesyng (adj.), enarmyng (pr. ppl. as sb.), menes (meaning: intermediary), Mercerye (Mercer is given), informacion (not listed as a legal term), and suggestion (listed only as a legal term). Bradley in the introduction admits the Dictionary is incomplete and that Stratmann was interested primarily in the Teutonic origin of words. Since the Rolls are valuable chiefly because of the introduction of old French words, Stratmann may perhaps be excused for overlooking them. Still, the omission of these fifteen words is proof that a more thorough and more comprehensive treatment of the period is needed. It is to be hoped that the new Middle English dictionary now under way in this country will answer this need and that the Rolls of Parliament will at length receive the consideration they deserve.

FREDERIC E. FAVERTY.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

### "LEYDE HERE LEGGES ALIRI"

I would call attention to the following lines from the B-text of *Piers Plowman* (Passus VI, 123-126):

Tho were faitoures aferde. and feyned hem blynde,  
*Somme leyde here legges aliri.* as such loseles conneth,  
 And made her mone to pieres. and preyde him of grace:  
 'For we haue no lymes to laboure with. lorde, y-graced be 3e!'

The expression *aliri* is unique, and has never been satisfactorily interpreted. Skeat hesitantly derives it from O. E. *lira*, which is defined by Bosworth as "fleshy part of the body without fat or bone, brawn." Hence—by an admittedly desperate leap—Skeat gives *aliri* as an adverb meaning *across*—"With the calf of one leg resting on the shin of the other. At least, he continues, "such seems to be the sense intended." The only similar word that he has met with occurs in a pseudo-Chaucerian line, "He fond her

ligging *lirylong*." In his separate edition of the first seven passus of the B-text, Skeat gives an abridged form of the same explanation, but adds, "Or perhaps it means—loosely stretched out." Here he seems to be thinking of what *lirylong* sounds like. Strattmann-Bradley and the N. E. D. both accept *across* for *aliri*, but with interrogation points. The latter restricts it to crossing the legs, presumably in the manner imagined by Skeat.

But the action of this part of the poem makes "with legs crossed" a very improbable translation for *aliri*. Piers' half-acre is being ploughed. His followers have been given the task of clearing off the weeds. Presumably they take the weeds to the edge of the field and pile them there—a point the importance of which will be apparent later. Among the people are certain "faitoures." (As the subsequent lines show, this word is to be taken in its specific sense of "faker"). These rascals lend dubious assistance by drinking and singing "how! trolli-lolli!" When Piers rests from ploughing, he walks over to see how his assistants are getting on. He angrily threatens the "faitoures" with the pangs of hunger, and the lines follow which I quoted at the outset.

Now if these rascals are "afraid," and "make their moan," and "pretend to be blind," and "beg him for mercy," how dare they lie sprawled out with their legs crossed calf over shin as if, like Peter Ibbetson, they were "dreaming true"? And how, while lying in this position, can they say, "We have no lymes to labour with?" The literalness of "feyned hem blynde" makes it unlikely that "we have no lymes" is to be taken in a merely figurative sense.

These "faitoures" are not lazy farm-hands, but professional beggars. In the next few lines, their offer to pray for Piers in return for alms is characteristic of the tribe. "Of beggeres and of bidderes. what best to be done?" is the problem they suggest to Piers' mind. These beggars are caught loafing. Frightened, they pretend to be blind, and *do something to their legs which enables them to assert that they "have no limbs" and must be supported by charity*. These are tricks "as such loseles conneth" from that time to this.

Perhaps they squatted on their hams with their legs tucked up under them so as to appear maimed. This rendering is about as

closely connected with O. E. *lira* as the "legs crossed" gloss, and accords much better with the sense. But still we are so far from a really satisfactory explanation that we are justified in seeking a solution which has nothing to do with *lira*.

The line in which *aliri* stands is substantially identical in all three texts, but the word itself appears in several different forms. In A, Skeat has *a-liri*; and in C, *a-lyry*. The N. E. D. notes also the following variant readings from the MSS.: *aliry*, *a lyry* and *a lery*. Now leaving *a* out of the question, let us concentrate upon the syllables *li*, *ly*, and *le*. Of these, *le* is the one that has offered most resistance to the influence of *r*. Let us exaggerate this resistance by pronouncing the word *lery*. Middle English *ē* (*a* as in *fate*) gives Modern English *ī* (*ee* as in *feet*). The sound appears as *le*, *lee* or *lea* in Modern English.

With *lea*, we are "getting warm." In the N. E. D., the dialectal word *learig* is defined as "a ridge left in grass at the end of a ploughed field." The word comes from O. E. *laeghrycg* (*leah* + *hrycg*).

*Leah* is modern *lea*, a word familiar in poetry. It is also, says Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*, "in general dialectal use in Scotland, Ireland and England." It means "pasture, grass-land, untilled land; cultivated land under grass; a field meadow."

The original meaning of *hrycg* is *back*, but it soon came to be used in the modern sense of *ridge*. In Scotland *rig* is a common form of the word in both senses. Jamieson says of *rig* as *ridge*: "It seems to receive the name from its resemblance to the back, in relation to the depression of the sides."

Having inspected the parts of *learig*, let us return to the whole word. In Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*, *learig* is noted as the fourteenth among fifteen compounds of *lea*. Its meaning is "a grass field; unploughed land; a ridge in a field left unploughed between two ridges bearing grain." All the examples given are from Scotland, but this fact is no argument against the wider distribution of the word in Middle English, especially since *lea* is still used dialectically all over England. It appears, however, that the definition of *learig* previously cited from the N. E. D. is too narrow to cover all cases. Evidently *learig* is now often felt simply as another form of *lea*, the meaning of *rig* being obscured except when enforced by a particular context. We may suppose,

however, that in our hypothetical Middle English equivalent of *learig* the *hrycg* retained all its significance, and that *learig*, even in its widest sense, meant something like “ridge in (or perhaps formed by) a piece of grassy, untilled land.”

So far as I know this word is unrecorded in Middle English. Stratmann does not recognize it. But since it exists in Old English and exists in modern dialectal English, it must have existed in Middle English. It is just the sort of word that would not be likely to find its way into literature and just the sort of word that the author of *Piers Plowman*, with his tremendous popular vocabulary, would be likely to know and use.

It seems quite legitimate to derive *aliri* from *on laeghrycg*. The *a* retains so much of its original prepositional character that it had better be written separately, as it is in several manuscripts. *Laeg* gives *le* directly. Hence *a lery*—which also has the merit of clearly suggesting the modern word—is perhaps preferable if sufficiently supported by manuscript authority, a point which I have no opportunity to determine. But the forms *liri* and *lyry*, as has earlier been suggested, present a logical and familiar modification, due to the influence of *r* in the second syllable. The change of *hrycg* into *rig*, even without the evidence of modern dialect, is phonologically normal. The loss of *g* as a sound, and consequently as a letter, is due to the fact that the strong accent on the first syllable made it difficult to voice the *g* in *rig*.

From the literary viewpoint, the advantages of translating *aliri* as in the *learig* are obvious. These “faitoures” were drinking and singing in the grass at the edge of the half-acre. When Piers came to upbraid them, they were afraid, and practised the arts of the professional beggar. They pretended to be blind, and “Somme leyde here legges a lery.” Some, that is, concealed their legs in the grass—perhaps taking advantage of chance depressions in the meadow, perhaps hiding their legs behind the slope of an actual ridge at the edge of the ploughed field.

This interpretation fits the sense perfectly, and linguistically it is not over-bold. Might it not be accepted in place of the old guess which even the editor responsible for it has admitted to be unsatisfactory?

HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD.

*Columbia University.*

THE IMPERATIVE USE OF THE GOTHIC INFINITIVE  
*HABAN* IN LUKE IX, 3

Luke ix, 3 reads in the original Greek *μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν*, which Wulfilā has rendered by *nih þan tweihnōs paidōs haban* thus preserving the original infinitive construction, *i. e.* the infinitive in an imperative function. Since there are no clear examples of the infinitive in an imperative function elsewhere in Gothic or in any other <sup>1</sup> of the Old Germanic dialects, we may assume that this use of the infinitive was not yet an established idiom in Germanic.

What then could have induced Wulfilā in this particular passage to retain the infinitive in Gothic, especially since in the foregoing passage he has rendered quite regularly Greek *μηδὲν αἰρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν* by *ni waitht nimaiþ in wig*, *i. e.* by the negative + the optative?

Evidently there was here in the use of the infinitive *haban* nothing to offend the Gothic speech-feeling. I attribute the retention of the Greek infinitive construction here to the fact that *it could not possibly be misunderstood*. Altho the infinitive in an imperative function had not yet developed into an established idiom in Gothic we are not justified in assuming that it *never* was so used in the vernacular <sup>2</sup> tongue.

In the sentence in question it is easy enough to see how an imperative idea could be understood in the infinitive. In the first place, this passage is immediately preceded by an imperative construction *ni waitht nimaiþ in wig*; and secondly, we might also feel the infinitive as dependent <sup>3</sup> upon a verb of command understood, *i. e.* [*anabiuda izwis*] *nih þan tweihnōs paidōs haban*, "[I command you] not to have two coats" = "do not have two coats."

I can see no reason, therefore, why we should not assume that this use of the infinitive *haban* in an imperative function was a native Gothic idiom; to be sure, rarely used because the Greek original rarely used it. It was evidently not so far established that it was used to translate a Greek imperative or subjunctive.

<sup>1</sup> The alleged examples of the O. E. infinitive in an imperative function are best interpreted with Callaway as subjunctive forms; cf. Morgan Callaway Jr., *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, 1913, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Compare this colloquial use of the infinitive in Modern German.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Modern English "no smoking here" = "no smoking [is allowed] here," which is equivalent to an imperative "do not smoke here"; cf. French *défense de fumer*.

. That in the Gothic translation indirect discourse was sometimes used for the original direct discourse of Jesus' commands is evident from I Cor. VII, 11. For the Greek ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ μενέτω ἄγαμος ἢ . . . καταλλαγῇτω Wulfila has *if jabai gaskaid-nai, wisan unliugaidai, aiþþau . . . gagawaiþþjan*. The two infinitives *wisan* and *gagawaiþþjan* translate the imperatives μενέτω and καταλλαγῇτω. But in the preceding verse we have the verb of command + the infinitive, i. e. παραγγέλλω . . . μὴ χωρισθῆναι, Gothic *anabiuda . . . ni skaidan*. Evidently, then, the two infinitives, *wisan* and *gagawaiþþjan*, are dependent in sense upon the verb *anabiuda* of the previous verse. All this goes to show how easy it was to feel the infinitive, especially in a series of commands, as the object of a verb of command either expressed or implied. When we compare our first passage <sup>4</sup> *nih þan tweiñnôs paidôs haban* with the passage just discussed we see that the imperative force of the infinitive *haban* might be in part due to the feeling for indirect discourse (after a verb of command understood).

That the other Old Germanic languages do not in this passage (Luke IX, 3) have the infinitive corresponding to Gothic *haban* is no doubt due to the influence of the Latin Vulgate mss., all of which render the original Greek infinitive by the subjunctive, i. e. *neque duas tunicas habeatis*.

The Anglo-Saxon rendering of this passage is: *nē gē nabbon twā tunecan*. For the form *nabbon* we find *nabban* in *C*, but the text of *C* is notoriously corrupt and cannot be utilized for determining the proper form. Even if the *nabban* of *C* were the proper form, the endings *-an*, *-on*, *-un*, etc. often occur in the present subjunctive alongside the normal ending *-en* (cf. Sievers, *Angs. Grm.*<sup>3</sup>, § 361, Anm. 1), so that we are justified in assuming that both forms, *nabbon* and *nabban*, are simply textual variations of the normal form of the present subjunctive *nabben*.

Evidently the reason why the scribe did not translate this passage by the usual construction, i. e. by the negative + the imperative

<sup>4</sup> Grimm (*Deutsche Grm.*, IV, 92) calls attention to both of these passages here discussed but he does not attempt to explain the imperative function of the infinitive *haban* in our first passage.

(*nē nabbe gē*), was that he tried to render the Latin construction, *i. e. neque . . . habeatis*; hence the use of the subjunctive *nē gē nabbon*...

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

*University of Kansas.*

### MRS. MONTAGU, CHURCHILL, AND MISS CHEERE

Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu, writing to Lord Lyttelton and later to Mrs. Carter, makes certain references to Charles Churchill that help clear up the facts of a discreditable incident in the satirist's life. She remarks to Lord Lyttelton, in an undated letter:

I take Churchill to be of the true serpent kind, and I do not wonder he stung the bosom that received and cherished him.<sup>1</sup>

To Mrs. Carter she writes (Dec. 4, 1763):

The disgrace Wilkes will incur for his blasphemy and this last instance of Churchill's wickedness in running away with the daughter of his benefactor, who has kept him from starving, will discountenance the ribbald [sic] freedom of writing and conversation for a time. Churchill is a married man, the poor girl is under 15 years of age whom he debauch'd; she is sent home to her unhappy father Sir Henry Cheere.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately for the poet's reputation, Mrs. Montagu's charge is substantiated by evidence that would seem indubitable. Hitherto, as far as I know, the poet's connection with Sir Henry Cheere has been unnoted.

On November 3, 1763, John Wilkes, the notorious demagogue, visited Churchill's house, and on November 5 stayed an hour and a half at "one Mr. Karr's [sic] at Vauxhall, where Mr. Churchill lodges."<sup>3</sup> It is not said that Wilkes saw Churchill upon these visits.

<sup>1</sup> *Mrs. Montagu, 'Queen of the Blues' her Letters and Friendships from 1762-1800.* Ed. by R. Blunt, Boston and New York, 1924, I, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Grenville Papers*, ed. by W. J. Smith, London, 1852, II, pp. 155-160.



Fitzgerald prints a letter from Wilkes to Churchill, dated from Great-George St., Nov. 3, [1763]. The writer speaks of his fear that Churchill will get into trouble:

I fear much a warrant, signed by the pale Mansfield, beginning the '*thing against Charles Churchill, clerk.*' Then a picture of the said Charles handing into court his Betsy, who will be ordered back to an angry papa, locked up, etc., and this you can't prevent. The family are in the greatest distress; and you are universally condemned for having made a worthy family unhappy. I except Cotes, your brother, and myself. It is known that you are at Aylesbury: therefore I submit to your Prudence, if you choose to continue there . . . The father, brother, and a servant went with pistols charged to Kingston Gardens, in consequence of an anonymous letter, to have assassinated you.<sup>4</sup>

To this, Churchill replied soon after, laughing at the threats; "Your advice, and the illness of Mrs. Carr, more than the fears of assassination, brought me to town."<sup>5</sup>

On November 18, 1763, Horace Walpole wrote to the Earl of Hertford as follows:

I forgot to tell you, and you may wonder at hearing nothing of the Reverend Mr. Charles Pylades [Churchill], while Mr. John Orestes [Wilkes] is making such a figure: but Dr. Pylades, the poet has forsaken his consort and the Muses, and is gone off with a stone-cutter's daughter. If he should come and offer himself to you for chaplain to the embassy!

In his will, dated November 3, 1764, Churchill gives to Elizabeth Carr, of Turnham Green, in the county of Middlesex, spinster, an annuity of fifty pounds a year during her natural life.<sup>6</sup>

As far as I know, no biographer of Churchill has made any successful attempt to identify the unfortunate family who were apparently the victims of the poet's unscrupulousness. Mrs. Montagu's reference, however, makes the identification easy. The *Dictionary of National Biography* gives a detailed account of the life and work of Sir Henry Cheere (1703-1781), "statuary," sculptor in marble, bronze, and lead, a man of importance in St. Margaret's Parish, Westminster, knighted in 1760, and made a baronet in 1766. This, in all probability, was the "stone-cutter,"

<sup>4</sup> P. Fitzgerald, *Life and Times of John Wilkes*, London, 1888, I, pp. 187-8.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 188.

<sup>6</sup> *Poetical Works of Churchill, Parnell, and Tickell*, Boston & N. Y., n. d., I, p. lxxxiii.

the "Mr. Karr" at whose house the poet was living in 1763. Tooke, Churchill's biographer, probably knew who "Mr. Carr" was, for he speaks of him as "a highly respectable sculptor in Westminster,"<sup>7</sup> but perhaps out of consideration for the family did not make the identification more definite. Mrs. Montagu's remark completes the evidence of this sordid incident in Churchill's career.

JOSEPH M. BEATTY, JR.

*Goucher College.*

---

## AN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY CRITICISM OF SPENSER

Thomas Heywood, in his curious and little-known work, *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*, printed in 1635, added his voice to the chorus of praise of Spenser which, as recent Spenserian research has shown us, was sounded, somewhat feebly it is true, throughout the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> In the prose excursus appended to the fourth book Heywood, in ringing the changes on that perennial theme, the neglect and scorn of poetry, not only cites Spenser as authority, but quotes at some length from the *Shepherd's Calender*.

That forrein Authors have not onely complained of the great scorne and contempt cast upon the Euthusiasmes [sic] and Raptures; as also that no due respect or honour hath been conferred upon the Professors thereof: whosoever shall call to minde the all praiseworthy and ever-to-be-remembred *Spenser*, shall finde that hee much bewailed this inherent and too common a disease of neglect which pursueth the Witty and inseparably cleaveth to the most Worthy. Witnesse, his *Teares of the Muses*, his *Colleen Clouts*, *Come home againe*; and divers other of his Workes: but more particularly in the tenth Eclogue of his *Shepherd's Calender*, in the moneth entituled October, you may reade him thus: . . .<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxxviii.

<sup>1</sup> See F. I. Carpenter, *Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser*, 229-280. In 1906 Koeppel noted allusions to Spenser's work and poetic ideas, with implicit criticisms, in Heywood's *Love's Mistress*, printed in 1636 ("Ben Jonson's Wirkung auf zeitgenossische Dramatiker und andere Studien," *Anglistische Forschungen*, xx, 89-90; Carpenter, *op. cit.*, 241).

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from the copy in the Wrenn Library, University of Texas, pp. 249-50.

Then follow six stanzas (lines 7-18, 55-78) from the eclogue mentioned.

Not only is Heywood's hearty admiration for Spenser as here evinced interesting, but equally so is the indication, in the occasional divergences from the correct readings, that he was quoting from memory. A few examples are: "are—been" (2), "lyggen—liggen" (21), "then—tho" (29), "rowle—roll" (34). Finally, no less noteworthy is the testimony confirmatory of our belief in the continued popularity, after Spenser's death, of the *Shepheardes Calender*.

F. F. COVINGTON, JR.

*University of Texas.*

---

#### A NOTE ON HAGEDORN'S AND HALLER'S GERMAN- ENGLISH LITERARY RELATIONS

In a comprehensive and stimulating article on Albrecht von Haller<sup>1</sup> which appeared recently, Professor Howard Mumford Jones has called attention to several interesting and significant problems in eighteenth century literature and philosophy. The question which he raises in a passing reference to Hagedorn as to that writer's priority over Haller in introducing certain features of English style into German literature suggests a comparative study of some aspects of their literary work. To such a study I have been devoting my attention for some time. Within the near future I expect to have my results ready for publication.

In this note, however, I desire merely to call attention to Mr. Jones' error in stating that "Hagedorn's . . . poems, even though written in 1729, did not appear until 1750."<sup>2</sup> Hagedorn's first collection of poems appeared in 1729; later collections came out in 1742-52, 1747, and 1750; and there were numerous later editions.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Howard Mumford Jones, *Albrecht von Haller and English Philosophy*, *PMLA.*, xi, 103-127.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108, footnote 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Versuch einiger Gedichte, oder erlesener Proben poetischer Nebenstunden* (König und Richter, Hamburg, 1729); *Oden und Lieder* (J. C. Bohn, Hamburg, 1747); *Friedrichs von Hagedorn moralische Gedichte* (Hamburg bei Johann Carl Bohn, 1750). In addition to the above collec-

The first complete edition of his works, to be sure, was not published until 1757;<sup>4</sup> but as I mentioned in my study on Hagedorn,<sup>5</sup> "before these poems [Hagedorn's *Moralische Gedichte*] were published together, most of them had appeared separately in quarto, as was the case with many English poems of that period; some had been printed several times."

BERTHA REED COFFMAN.

*Simmons College.*

### AUTHORSHIP OF *THE BRITISH GRAMMAR*

In the year 1763 there was published anonymously in London by A. Millar a grammar entitled "The British Grammar; or, An Essay in Four Parts, towards Speaking and Writing the English Language Grammatically and Inditing Elegantly. For the Use of the Schools of Great Britain and Ireland, and of Private Young Gentlemen and Ladies." A second edition appeared in 1768, a third in 1779, and an American edition in 1784, published in Boston, Mass. None of the ordinary helps of the bibliographer, such as the Library of Congress Catalogue, the British Museum Catalogue, etc., offers any suggestions as to the authorship of the book, and while it may have been known to many in the late eighteenth century, during the early nineteenth the knowledge must have disappeared, for in his "Notices of English Grammars," published in the third volume of the *Common School Journal* of 1841, so well-informed a historian of English grammar as Wm. H. Wells discussed the book with apparently no suspicion of its authorship.

However, in Vol. I of the *Catalogue of the Library of the Peabody Institute*, published in 1883, a careful cataloguer has entered under the name of James Buchanan this little grammar of anony-

tions of poems he brought out a *Sammlung neuer Oden und Lieder* (J. C. Bohn, Hamburg, 1742-1752). Volumes II and III are dated 1744 and 1752 respectively; Volume I, which was missing in the set which I consulted in the Library of the University of Chicago, was naturally 1742.

<sup>4</sup> *Poetische Werke* (Hamburg, bei Johann Carl Bohn, 1757). Hagedorn arranged his works himself for this edition, which appeared after his death.

<sup>5</sup> "The Influence of English Literature on Friedrich von Hagedorn," *Modern Philology*, XII, 131.

meous publication. When I came across this entry I recalled that Wells had said, in the series of notices of English grammars above-mentioned, that Buchanan's *Regular English Syntax*, published under his name in 1767, in London, was "A most egregious plagiarism, borrowed from the *British Grammar*, half the volume copied . . . verbatim,"<sup>1</sup> and I suspected that Buchanan had not plagiarized from another author but had merely revised and cut down an earlier text-book of his own to serve a somewhat different purpose. A comparison of the two books proves beyond any possibility of refutation, I believe, that Buchanan was the author of the *British Grammar*. And so, because I have had difficulty in getting this information through the ordinary channels, I have thought that it may be interesting and useful to others to know just what evidence there is for ascribing to Buchanan the authorship of the *British Grammar*, as well as of the *Regular English Syntax*. I have not, unfortunately, had access recently to the original editions of these two grammars, but I believe that the copies which I have, namely, of the third (1779) edition of the *B. G.* and the American (1783) edition of the *R. E. S.*, do not differ very much from the original editions.

One has only to read the two prefaces to be convinced that it is the same writer speaking in both. The passage, for example, beginning on page xvii of the *B. G.*, "I might here make Quotations from the celebrated Mr. Locke, and some other Writers, on Education, strongly recommending and enforcing the Instruction of the British Youth in the Grammar of their own Language . . .," begins on page xxi of the *R. E. S.*, "Quotations might here be made . . ." and then follows exactly the wording of the passage in the earlier preface. A certain anonymous writer of a letter published in Turnbull's *Observations on a Liberal Education* is quoted from quite freely in the preface of the *B. G.* and much of this quoted matter reappears verbatim in the preface of the *R. E. S.* The passage which is most important in identifying the authorship of the two books is that which on page xx of the *B. G.* begins, "Another Exercise should be obliging them to speak every Day their unwritten Thoughts on any Subject in English," and on page xxvii of the *R. E. S.*, "To oblige young Gentlemen to speak every Day their unwritten Thoughts on any Subject in English."

<sup>1</sup> *Common School Journal*, Vol. 3, p. 231. 1841.

For in a footnote to the passage in the *B. G.* the author says, "I am sorry to differ from this judicious Writer; but I think it would be more rational and natural to let young Gentlemen first deliver their written Thoughts, I mean the Subjects given them for Exercises, as the Foundation of Oratory, whether extemporary or studied," while in the later *R. E. S.*, on page xxviii, I find, "I was sorry to differ from this sensible Writer in the Preface to the *British Grammar*; but from Experience I am still of the same Opinion, namely, that it would be more rational to let young Gentlemen first deliver their written Thoughts, I mean the Subjects given them for Exercises as the Foundation of Oratory, whether extemporary or studied."

But even without this definite allusion to his earlier expression of opinion in the preface of the *B. G.*, one is convinced of the identity of authorship merely from a comparison of the grammars themselves. Part I of the *B. G.*, entitled "Of Orthography," and comprising pages 3-56 is essentially Chapter I of the *R. E. S.* which covers pages 1-12. Part III of the *B. G.*, pages 71-164, "Of Etymology," is Chapter II of the *R. E. S.*, pages 12-67, while Part IV of the *B. G.*, entitled "Of Syntax," is reproduced, largely verbatim, as the second unnumbered section of the book with the title "A Regular English Syntax."

Various little similarities of style and phrasing are to be noted also, such as "the following sheets" in the Dedication of the *B. G.* and on page iv of the *R. E. S.*, and the expression "the British Youth."

While the author states on both title pages that his books are intended for the use of "private young Gentlemen and Ladies," the earlier grammar was planned for the use of more mature students, while in the later book "the several Materials have been crowded within as narrow Bounds as was consistent with Perspicuity," and otherwise adapted to beginners by being thrown into question and answer.

While Buchanan's *Essay towards Establishing a Standard for an Elegant and Uniform Pronunciation* (published 1766) seems to be well known,<sup>2</sup> others of his books do not appear to have survived

<sup>2</sup> Mathes, Karl. *Englische Lautlehre nach James Buchanan* (1766). A Giessen dissertation. 1915. ix + 41 pp.

as well, and the influence and output of the man has not received of late years the attention that it really deserves. On page 65 of the *B. G.* (3rd ed.) he speaks of his English Dictionary, presumably his *Linguae Britannicae Vera Pronunciatio or New English Dictionary*, first published in 1757, apparently, and reedited in 1769. In the *Monthly Review*, Vol. 17, page 376, appeared a notice of *A New Pocket-Book for Young Gentlemen and Ladies: or, A Spelling-Dictionary of the English Language*. London, Baldwin, 1757. Buchanan is given as the author of this. He also published in 1770 *A Plan of an English Grammar School Education*, in which he seems to have devoted a good deal of attention to the study of the English language. And this must have come after years of experience and thought on the subject of English study, for his earliest publication of which I have any record was entitled *The Complete English Scholar. In Three Parts. Containing a new, short, and familiar method of instructing children, and perfecting grown persons in the English tongue, and of learning grammar in general, without the help of Latin*, and was published in London by A. Millar, in 1753. Indeed, in the Preface of the *British Grammar*, he says he has presumed to offer the public a grammar "gleaned either from a Course of Reading, or deduced from a Series of Observations, the Result of many Years Practice."

ARTHUR G. KENNEDY.

Stanford University.

---

## A NOTE ON GUILLEN DE CASTRO

It is uncertain when the very first collection of the plays of D. Guillén de Castro y Bellvis was published. Ticknor<sup>1</sup> speaks of a first volume printed in 1614, but there is no evidence that he or any one else ever saw it.

Recently I learned of the existence in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris and in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid of a volume dated 1614 entitled *Doze | comedias | famosas de quatro | poetas naturales de la | insigne y coronada civ | dad de Valencia* (En Madrid por Miguel Serrano de Vargas), containing two plays

<sup>1</sup> *History of Spanish Literature*, 1879, II, 355, footnote 11.

by Castro.<sup>2</sup> This is merely a reprint of the well-known collection of 1608 of the same name, published at Valencia by Aurelio Mèy and reproduced the following year in Barcelona by Sebastián de Cormellas.<sup>3</sup>

Inasmuch as this is the only book on record containing anything by Castro that is dated 1614, I am tempted to hazard the conjecture that this is the volume that may have been responsible for Ticknor's unsubstantiated footnote.

HYMEN ALPERN.

*New York University.*

---

### THE *MERCHANT'S TALE* IN CHAUCER JUNIOR

Chaucer Junior was one of the many purveyors of anecdotes and stories to the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> Apparently his identity lies effectually buried in his pseudonym, but his jest-book, which takes the name *Canterbury Tales*, has had a length of life that many proudly fathered books have missed. The latest edition known to me is represented by a copy in the British Museum for which the date 1815 is queried, and the earliest by a copy in the Pepysian library at Cambridge dated 1687. Perhaps the 1687 edition is not the first.

Miss Hammond mentions the collection, referring only to two dateless editions, the first of which she has examined and which by its title and number of pages would seem to be somewhat similar to the Pepysian copy.<sup>2</sup> But Miss Hammond says that the title *Canterbury Tales* was "abused" herein by "short prose anecdotes of the coarsest character," and if the jests are really those of

<sup>2</sup> *Caballero bobo* and *El Amor constante*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía madrileña*, Madrid, 1891, II.

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography of Mr. Arundell Esdaile, *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740*, 1912, gives an adequate idea of the extent of jest-book literature in the period and of its importance for the student. The most interesting of the earlier collections have been edited by W. C. Hazlitt in the familiar *Shakespeare Jest-Books*, and a recent study of value for more than its special application is Professor Thornton S. Graves' *Jonson in the Jest-Books, The Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature*, 1923, pp. 127 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Chaucer, a Bibliographical Manual*, p. 155.



the 1687 edition, she does not mention a fact which both mitigates abuse in the title and makes the crude work of Chaucer Junior more noteworthy. He pays Chaucer the not entirely questionable compliment of retelling the *Miller's Tale* and the *Merchant's Tale* in the hope that they will please his chap-book clientele. That is to say, for the *Miller's Tale* he tells Chaucer's telescoped fabliaux of the clerk who foretells a flood in order to trick a husband and of the second lover who gets revenge for his discomfiture by the clerk, all as it was put together by Chaucer but with only bare facts and no names. But for the *Merchant's Tale* he intrigues us by recounting Boccaccio's version of the pear-tree incident, supposedly preferring it deliberately to Chaucer's. The bare possibility that Chaucer Junior did not know the *Decameron* and that by telling Boccaccio's story he proves it naturalized in England is arresting, but probably Chaucer Junior knew the *Decameron*, at least through English translation.

The copy in the Pepysian library is bound up with that collection of popular literature which has been named *Penny Merriments*.<sup>3</sup> It has twenty-three pages and contains sixteen prose stories or anecdotes together with three songs. The stories are sometimes so short as to be merely witty answers, usually indecent, and the events are all laid in Canterbury. The title-page in full is as follows:

*Canterbury Tales: composed For the Entertainment of All Ingenious young Men and Maids at their merry Meetings, upon Christmas, Easter, Whitson-tide, or any other time; especially in long Winter Evenings, to keep good Wits imply'd. Intermixt with pleasant Stories, witty Jests, and delightful Songs, very proper for either City, Town or Country, with an Epistle Dedicated to the Bakers, Smiths and Millars. By Chaucer Junior. This may be Printed, R. P. Printed for J. Back at the Black Boy near the Draw-Bridge on London-Bridge, 1687.*

The hint is plain that such a collection was meant as a stock of folk-lore which, once it had been started, would circulate without the aid of the printed page. Purchasers were meant to, and probably did, buy the book to increase the fund of entertaining jests which they could recall from memory upon fitting occasions.

<sup>3</sup> II, pp. 225 ff.

In other words, the complete cycle through which a folk-tale of vitality may travel is at least indicated, from the folk to the skilful hand of a sophisticated author like Chaucer or Boccaccio and back to the folk again through the popularizing ministrations of a go-between. That the medieval story of the pear-tree in all its forms had been entirely forgotten by the unlettered in England and that Chaucer Junior gave oral life to it again would be contentions perhaps too difficult to prove.

The promised "epistle" of the jest-book is brief and has a homely concreteness. It runs:

The Dedication to the Bakers, Smiths, Millers, and other Readers.

You are presented here with a choice Banquet of delightful Tales, pleasant Stories, witty Jests, and merry Songs to divert the young Men and Maids when they come to the Bake-house, Forge or Mill; and by these you may encrease your Trade and call customers to you: for be sure the merry Lasses will go where they can be furnished with Tales, Stories and Jests; therefore these are as necessary for you as a fair Wife for a fine Tavern, a young Hostess for an old Inn, or a Gazet for a Coffee-House. It is fitted for all manner of Persons, therefore I hope you will all furnish your selves with it; for it will be a rare companion for Old and Young upon many Occasions; especially at *Christmas, Easter, Whitsontide*, or long Winter Evenings over a Cup of Nut-brown Ale and Lambs-wool. In a word, you will find it as comfortable as Matrimony, or as sweet as a Maiden-head at midnight, or a Sack-Posset at the latter end of a Fire. What would you have more, the young Men and Maids may laugh till their Lungs ake, and the old and melancholly, will find Dr. *Merryman* the best Physitian.

The *Miller's Tale*, wholly without title or reference to Chaucer's Miller, is the sixth in Chaucer Junior, and the pear-tree story, also without title, is the eleventh. Although the story of the carpenter and his wife's lovers is no less interesting than the other for the method which reduces it to the compass of the popular mind, it does not depart from Chaucer in any essential fact and is less worth reproduction. The pear-tree story, very like the *Miller's Tale* in length and form, is as follows:

A Beautiful young Gentlewoman of *Canterbury*, being wedded to an Old Man in respect of his Riches, he being as full of Ice, as she of Fire, had a mind to try the difference between young and old Flesh, shewed some kindness more than ordinary to her Serving-man; which he perceiving, lays hold of all Opportunities to address himself to her by way of Love; but she would not yield to his Desire, unless he would contrive some way

to cornute her Husband in his presence and he not to believe it, this caused the Serving-man to stretch his Invention upon the Rack, who at last acquainted his Mistress that he had found an Experiment to do it, provided she would when her Husband and she was a walking in the Garden, pretend to Long for some Fruit on some of the highest Trees, and to leave to him the management of the rest, which accordingly she did: The Old Man calling his Man to ascend the tree to gather the Fruit; which, as soon as he got up, cried out with a loud Voice, Master, Master, leave off for shame, I never in all my life see so unseemly an Action, for shame disengage yourself from my Mistress, or else some of the Neighbours will see you: the old Man amazed at this Language, asked if the Fellow was mad, and what he meant? O Sir, said the Man, the Tree is either bewitched or else I can not believe mine own Eyes; for I fancy I see you upon my Mistress. Come down, come down, and let me get up the Tree to know if, it seems so to me; the Fellow comes down and the old Man gets up: in the Interim, the young Fellow fell to work with his Mistress, the old Man looks down and sees it, cries out, in good Faith says he, it seems to me just as it did to you, for methinks I see you upon your Mistress as perfectly as if it was really so: the old Man gets down and thinks the Tree bewitched; orders presently to be cut down, for fear it should infect the rest. Thus was the old Man made a Cuckold to his own Face and would not believe it.

It may be that Chaucer Junior, if indeed his and not an earlier jest-book is the first to give the story in this form, confused his Chaucer and his Boccaccio,<sup>4</sup> but more probably, in view of his good memory for the *Miller's Tale*, he deliberately chose to follow Boccaccio, though the other version of the story, in which the husband is blind, had been told for Englishmen by Caxton<sup>5</sup> as well as by Chaucer. The 1620 translation of the *Decameron*<sup>6</sup> at least does not furnish any hint as to why Chaucer Junior made his changes or omissions. The explanation seems to be the natural feeling of the story-teller for the temper of his audience. He robs the woman of almost all that wiliness which was the point of Boccaccio's tale for any mediæval reader and makes the man the contriver of the trickery. The tests of the woman by the lover, in which she is made by Boccaccio to show the most delicate artistry in intrigue, and their climax in the extraction of the tooth are omitted, evidently as too fine spun and too protract-

<sup>4</sup> Seventh day, ninth story.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Chaucer Society *Originals and Analogues*, pp. 181-2.

<sup>6</sup> Reprinted 1909 with introduction by Edward Hutton.

ed for the "bakers, smiths, millers, and other readers." Also the audacious irony of Boccaccio's Lydia, who has the tree cut down because it has sinned against her honor and might do wrong to some other woman, becomes in Chaucer Junior the condemning of a bewitched tree by the husband, something that "all ingenious young men and maids" of the countryside could understand.

WILLARD FARNHAM.

*University of California.*

### A SOURCE FOR *TARTUFFE*, 1067-1070.

In Du Ryer's *Lucrèce* (pub. 1638), iv, 2 are found the following lines:

Ne vous abusez plus, ne croyez plus aux fables.  
L'honneur n'est qu'un faux Dieu qui fait des misérables;  
A sçavoir icy bas secrettement aymer,  
Consiste la vertu que l'on doit estimer.

These might be supposed to have furnished a suggestion for *Tartuffe* 1502-1506, except that a passage in Regnier seems to be nearer. Other lines in *Lucrèce*, however, are nearer to *Tartuffe* 1067-1070 than anything that has been suggested. They occur shortly after Collatin has foolishly invited Tarquin to his house and the latter has made proposals to Lucrèce. The lines are:

Lors qu'on attaque ainsi la vertu d'une femme,  
Elle doit d'elle-mesme estouffer cette flamme,  
Et n'en peut avertir un mary généreux,  
Sans exciter un feu beaucoup plus dangereux.

Since Molière in 1644 bought Du Ryer's *Scévole*, which was played many times by him later, and also played *Alcionée* with the *Précieuses Ridicules* in 1659, there is no doubt he knew Du Ryer's tragedies well.

HERMAN BELL.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## REVIEWS.

---

*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.* Edited by J. R. R. TOLKIEN and E. V. GORDON. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

The two Oxford scholars who have collaborated on this much needed edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* have produced a book of great importance for students of Middle English. They renounce any intention of adding to our knowledge of subjects that have little direct bearing on the poem itself. Indeed, their introduction contains hardly a single new suggestion about the author and his works, or about the genesis of his story, though it judiciously reviews what has been written on these subjects by other scholars. Their primary object has been to expound the meaning of one of the most difficult texts in Middle English, and in this, surely the chief duty of an editor, they have admirably succeeded. The notes, besides discussing textual problems, provide illuminating comment on mediaeval customs, and especially on the Arthurian background of the poem. A brief section on the poet's language contains helpful analyses of the large Scandinavian and French elements in the vocabulary. The excellent glossary is the first to accompany the poem since the entirely inadequate one of Morris's edition (1864), for Gollancz in his revisions (1897, 1912) has printed only the text.

The book is convenient in size and pleasant in appearance. These advantages would not have been forfeited by the inclusion of a more extensive bibliography. The lack of an adequate bibliography is the more noticeable because of the paucity of bibliographical references in the notes. In avoiding the tendency of American and German editors to swamp their texts in a sea of references, English editors, it seems, are apt to fall into the opposite error. After all, *Gawain* is likely to be read not so much by the beginner in Middle English as by the advanced student, who would welcome bibliographical help.<sup>1</sup> In this connection it may be noted that the Select Bibliography fails to mention Morris's revision of 1869, which differs frequently in details from the first printing of 1864, even though it was not issued as a new edition.

The text, the preface tells us, is free from 'a litter of italics, asterisks, and brackets, the trail of the passing editor.' Deviations from the manuscript are noted only at the bottom of the page. The editors do not record the frequent cases where the original

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hulbert's criticism, *Modern Philology*, xxiii, 246-9. J. H. G. Grattan, *Review of English Studies*, i, 484-7, on the other hand, commends the editors for not attempting to epitomize all the 'literature' that has gathered around the poem.

scribe has first written the wrong letter and then corrected it, and this is not strictly necessary. But fuller information about the state of the text would occasionally be helpful. Thus no mention is made of the fact that a second hand has made corrections and retraced words in dark brown ink where the manuscript is rubbed or illegible. In most cases this is of no importance, as in *make*, 43, where the last three letters are obviously in a different hand. But sometimes this retracing may account for forms that are not usual in the manuscript, such as *jayld*, 658 (*f* and *d* rewritten); *yourr*, 1214, an error unnoted by the editors in a passage where there is a good deal of retracing; *woled*, 1508, where the *ed* seems to be retraced, possibly over a *de*. A few minor misreadings may be added: the manuscript has *pe proude* 163, not *pe proude*; of *ofer*, 591, the editors say that 'what was read as *u* is really part of *β*, the lower portion of which had faded,' but the letter seems clearly *u*, and is quite unlike the top of the scribe's *β*, though *ofer* was undoubtedly the author's word; on the other hand, the final letter of *lyzli*, 608, ought to be read as *y*, though all except the first stroke is faint; *spekere*, 2461, which the editors print as the manuscript reading, following Gollancz, is really *speked*.

In the reading of the passages that have been blotted on the opposite page, the so-called 'off-sets,' Tolkien and Gordon have in one instance succeeded better than Knott, who first observed their value (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxx, 102). In the famous passage describing the boar-hunt, *grȳme*, 1442, is certainly right, not *grȳdre*, as read by Knott. But the preceding word is, I think, neither Knott's queried *hise*, nor Tolkien and Gordon's *pis*—which they supply and do not pretend to read—but plainly *ful* in the offset.<sup>2</sup> Fortunately this reading makes as good sense, if not better, than the previous ones: 'Ful grymme quen he gronyed, þenne greued mony.' In 1444 both Knott and the Oxford editors seem to me too confident in reading *sped(e)* (Knott *spede rad*) in the offset; it looks as much like *sparred*, which would be ME. *sparre*, 'spring, thrust rapidly,' see *Pearl* 1169 and *NED*. s. v. *spar*, v. 3, where *Wars of Alexander* 2975, and *Destruction of Troy* 6690, 6914 are cited. 'Sparred forth good spedoute spyt more.' In 2329, 'þe couenaunt schop ryȝt so, Schapen in Arþureȝ halles,' Knott and the editors seem to have been misled by the *schop* of the preceding line and Gollancz's emendation [*schaped*] into seeing *scha(pen)* in the offset. The first three letters seem to me to be *fer* or possibly *fet*, and the word is probably *fermed*, 'confirmed' or *fetled*, 'arranged.'

<sup>2</sup> One dislikes to appear too positive when competent scholars are unwilling to commit themselves, but the skeptical may now take the Early English Text Society's facsimile, and read for themselves with the aid of a mirror and sunlight. My own readings are based on the manuscript itself, which I studied in 1922, my rotograph, and the new facsimile.

Besides, the assumed repetition of the same word *schop* . . . *schapen*, like that of *spede* . . . *good sped* (1444) would not be characteristic of the author. Finally, Knott is surely right in reading *hor* not *bor* in 1441, and I agree with him in seeing traces of what looks like *hoge* beneath the blot: 'For he wat; hoge, hor alþer grattest.'

Of the many emendations that have been proposed for *Gawain*, the editors wisely adopt very few. Some of their own suggestions, such as *lachez*, for *cachez*, 1906, where a word beginning with *l* is required for the alliteration, are likely to win favor. *Both* for *bol*, 144 (Napier's suggestion) spoils the sense, for a contrast must be intended between the preceding line which describes the Green Knight's back and breast as 'sturne' and that which describes 'his wombe and his wast' as 'worthily smale,' a contrast quite in accord with mediaeval ideals of strength and beauty. 'Alle his forsnes he fong at þe fyue joyez,' 646, the editors have emended to 'Alle his fersnes he feng,' etc. But *fong* occurs in *Pearl* 884, and 'strength of character' (*forceness* is recorded elsewhere) rather than 'fierceness' is what Gawain would derive from the Five Joys. *Iquere*, 660, emended to *aiquere*, may easily be ME. *ywhere*, OE. *gehwær*, 'everywhere'; *ayquere* is elsewhere always spelled with a *y*.

Readings that have been previously considered difficult the editors frequently make clear by new punctuation, and in this respect their text marks a great advance over that of the Early English Text Society. Thus *bi grypte* for *bi-grypte*, 214; *þe, lede* for *þe lede*, 258; *to his cort-feréz* for *to his cort ferez*, 594, are slight changes, but make notable improvement in the sense. The recognition of parenthetical clauses in 1511 ff. and 1860 makes the text intelligible, though the similar parenthesis in 1623 hardly solves the difficulty. Different punctuation would, I think, explain the beginning of the quatrain (2207-11), which is paraphrased 'Let God work [his will]; ah well! it helps me not a bit [to be afraid]. I should punctuate:

Let God worche! 'We loo'—  
Hit helpeþ me not a mote,

and paraphrase 'Let God work his will! 'Alas' (i. e. lamentation) helps me not a bit,' with redundant *hit* as frequently. The occasional paraphrases in the notes are so helpful that it might have been advisable to include more explanations of passages such as 132-3, 821, where competent translators and learned commentators have gone astray. The editors interpret line 2511: 'For non may hyden his harme, bot vnhap ne may hit' as meaning 'For none may hide his (spiritual) harm, but he cannot unfasten it.' But even the author of *Gawain* can hardly be guilty of the extremely unnatural word-order which this explanation assumes in the second

clause. I see no difficulty in the usual interpretation: 'without misfortune ensuing.' Gawain means that he is going to wear the lace as the sign of his shame, for he has learned by experience that misfortune always results from attempting to conceal one's guilt.

The glossary, which contains many new definitions and etymologies, is a valuable contribution to Middle English lexicography. Especially important is the recognition of the large Scandinavian element in vocabulary and phraseology. *Fyske*, 'scamper,' is derived from ON. *fýsask*, 'desire,' but in meaning it seems more closely connected with OE. *fýsan*, 'hasten.' *Twynne* with double *n* is from ON. *lwinna* rather than OE. *lwinan*. The noun *wykeȝ*, used of the corners of the boar's mouth, is clearly to be connected with ON. *vík* (cf. *munnavík*) rather than OE. *wíc*, 'creek.' Because of the alliterative requirements many words are used in extraordinary senses, and many of the definitions are, of course, purely contextual (e. g. *neȝe*, 'touch,' 1836). *Chekke* in line 1107 means 'booty, gain,' the commonest meaning of OF. *eschec*, rather than mere 'fortune.' There are very few errors or misprints. In the section on language the verb *ȝaule* is twice cited (pp. 126, 127) as *ȝoule*.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

---

*Handbuch der mittelenenglischen Grammatik, Erster Teil: Lautlehre.* By RICHARD JORDAN. xvi + 273 pp. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg, 1925. M. 8.

It is a curious fact that no thoroughgoing scientific grammar of Middle English has yet been written. The Wrights have given us a sound elementary grammar, it is true, but no definitive work exists. Morsbach's grammar will never be brought to completion, and now the untimely death of Jordan takes away the one scholar who had devoted himself to the long neglected task. Before he died he had got out his *Lautlehre*, fortunately enough. It is this which is before us for review. The volume reflects the man. Its fulness, its accuracy, its ordered array of facts, move one to admiration. In its making Jordan lived up to the exacting standards of present-day grammatical study, and his book now holds the field as the authoritative work on Middle English phonology. And yet one is not altogether satisfied with it. Clear and systematic though it be, it lacks the freshness of approach which one ought to feel in the *magnum opus* of a master. Jordan's grammar is a fine and a useful piece of work, but it breaks no new ground. It is so thoroughly in line with our grammatical tradition that we could get on without it.



I will illustrate with the traditional division of the Middle English vocabulary into two parts, the Germanic and the Romanic elements, so-called. This division Jordan follows, of course; indeed, his whole method of study is dominated by it. We are given, first, the phonology of the Germanic element, then that of the Romanic element. This procedure, I think, is unsound, at bottom. It has grown, not so much out of the phonological phenomena themselves as out of the etymological point of view which dominated grammatical study in the pre-scientific age. A rigidly scientific method of approach would call for a different division, a division into native words and loan-words, the latter group falling into as many subdivisions as there were languages concerned. Thus, after taking up the sound-changes in native words, the grammarian would consider the various groups or loan-words each for itself. His chapters on Dutch words in Middle English would be worked out as systematically as would be his chapters on French words. Such classifications as Germanic and Romanic have little if any point for the Middle English period. The Dutch-sound-system is a thing for itself, and the study of what happened to it in English mouths is only confused by a quasi-identification of Dutch and English under the head Germanic. Similarly, Latin and French are only confounded if one persists in lumping them together as Romanic.

Errors or omissions in matters of detail are not absent from Jordan's work, though infrequent. Thus, *capun* (p. 20) is not an OE. but an early ME. borrowing; cf. Max Förster, *Anglia*, xli, 121, note 3. The French pronunciation of *u* in words like *reducen* (p. 21) is no proof of anything except the triumph of the Anglo-French spelling-system. O. Funke's paper in *Englische Studien*, lv, 1-25, should be included in the bibliography at the top of p. 21. Under *brawl* (p. 24) a reference to my etymology (*Mod. Phil.*, xx, 198) would have been in place. On p. 192 the author should have referred, at least, to H. D. Learned's *Accentuation of OF, Loanwords in English*, *PMLA*, xxxvii, 707 ff. The diphthong *ui* (rather than *oi*) cannot safely be deduced, in words like *anguish*, by the development of the first element to a *w* upon stress-shift to the second element (p. 211); for monosyllabic *o* as well as *u* might perfectly well become *w*, under the circumstances.

The Johns Hopkins University.

KEMP MALONE.

*Etudes sur la théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance*, par MAURICE MIGNON (Paris, Champion, 1923).

Much genuine scholarship is shown by the five papers by M. Mignon included in this small pamphlet. The careful criticism of Ariosto's

comedies, especially of *La Cassaria* and *I Suppositi*, the notice of Revisius Textor—Jean Tixier de Ravisy—announced as preliminary to a more complete forthcoming study, and the concluding essay on the Italian theatre at Lyons in the Renaissance, all introduce some new material and bring both that and facts already known into thoughtfully defined relationship to the history of French drama. M. Mignon's belief is that Italian models were even more important to French playwrights than Moland and others have stated. Ariosto's influence seems to him particularly pervasive, though in his discussion he does not emphasize Ariosto's influence so much as his subjects and style. Textor's life is sympathetically set forth in the paper devoted to him, and the reasons for his popularity in the pedagogical world of his time are fully explained. The last chapter contains several new notes on Italian actors in Lyons, most famous among them the early sixteenth-century visitor, Alione, writer of carnival farces and macaronic verse, and Isabella Andreini, the greatly praised *prima donna* who died there in 1604.

WINIFRED SMITH.

*Vassar College.*

---

*The Chaucer Tradition.* By AAGE BRUSENDORFF. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925. Pp. 510. \$5.50.

To observing eyes it has become apparent that a scholarly interest in Chaucer has of late noticeably declined. For this two reasons may be given. Students, even before the war, had begun to turn their attention to later periods. But it was felt, by Chaucer specialists likewise, that the major evidence was all in. So completely had the field been revolutionized (a comparison between the two editions of Root will show what was done in a decade and a half), that nothing of great moment—so it was argued—could be unearthed. Much of the credit for putting Chaucer into his proper light, it may be said, goes to this country, and forms a brilliant chapter in the history of English scholarship in America.

At the moment, however, when Chaucerian investigation with us is at low ebb, there comes from Copenhagen (continuation of a doctor's dissertation begun under Jespersen) one of the most important studies in recent years. Conclusions innumerable, accepted by scholars as final, are challenged, and fresh contributions appear on nearly every page. The author's equipment is masterly: an intimate acquaintance with the vast body of Chaucer criticism; a grasp of linguistics as well as of mediaeval history and literature; and—of paramount importance—a first-hand knowledge of the mss. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that Dr.

Brusendorff sets new standards in Chaucerian research; it is certain that his volume will stimulate many a seminar.

His approach, strangely overlooked hitherto, is sound: "to examine the way in which the knowledge of Chaucer's personality and writings was handed down, . . . in order to show that our information, scrappy though it is, represents a fully authoritative tradition, which yields some important biographical facts about the poet and offers the sole reliable basis for a true bibliographical canon of his works" (Preface). It is but fair to state that this thesis (as well as the title) inadequately suggests the wealth of material in the book.

In the opening chapter, entitled "Problems," evidence is given that the *Troilus* ms. (Corpus Christi Coll. Camb.) is probably authentic, since it was in the possession of the descendants of John of Gaunt. Accordingly, the portrait (two reproductions appear) of Chaucer reading before the court comes close to being a genuine representation. It can no longer be doubted that Thomas was the poet's son,—a conclusion independently arrived at by Professor Martin Ruud in his valuable monograph ("Thomas Chaucer": *Univ. of Minn. Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, 1926). But the much-maligned Lydgate knew "rather intimately" two generations of the Chaucer family; indeed Thomas was one of his patrons. Naturally the value of Lydgate's information is increased. When he says therefore that the *LGW* was written "at the request of the queen," it "must surely be allowed to settle the old question whether the queen, Anne . . . is represented by the Alcestis figure" (p. 40). Finally, it was through the Monk of Bury that Shirley came to know the poet's descendants and his writings (p. 42), an important fact as we shall later see.

The *Cant. Tales* are discussed in Chap. II: "The Principles of Textual Criticism"; "The ms. Groups"; "The Text." The Ellesmere "is much the best group and in doubtful cases it is always safest to accept its evidence"; occasionally, however, the Oxford variants give the best reading" (pp. 106 ff.). In the Man of Law's Epilogue, B. suggests *Yeoman* instead of *Shipman*; but this conjecture does not take into account the inappropriateness of language to the forester. To be sure we know little of the Yeoman. Still, would the knight have had as an attendant one of the loose kind?

The Host's comments on Griselda, which are undoubtedly genuine, B. would place immediately after the Clerk's Envoy: "the light, humorous touch of the stanza was due to Chaucer's definite wish for artistic relief from the savage attacks on women in the Envoy and the Merchant's Prologue" (p. 76). The four contemporary tragedies of the Monk, the author (following the all England tradition) would place at the end (pp. 77 f.). B. rightly warns against tampering too freely with the text of Chaucer;

scribes and modern editors have taken too many liberties, believing the poet could write no faultless line (108 ff.). For good reasons the theory that the *Shipman's Tale* was intended for the Wife of Bath is rejected (pp. 118 f.). Not the least valuable part of Brunsendorff's work is his discussion of the duration of the pilgrimage and the arrangement of the tales (pp. 120 ff.). Since Chaucer was probably not responsible for the titles of his tales, B. raises the question whether "Unworthy Sone of Eve" is after all a slip (p. 131).

The longer works are taken up in Chap. III. Lydgate's well known remark on "Dante in Ynglyssh" the author believes refers to a part or whole of the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (pp. 149 ff.). The *HF* is thought to celebrate the royal engagement. It was on or about Dec. 10 (cf. *HF*, ll. 63, 111), 1380, that Richard finally decided to marry. Brunsendorff's view is greatly strengthened by the mention of Froissart's *Le Temple D'Onnour*, a poetical dream vision treating an actual marriage which likely served as a model for the *HF* (pp. 158 ff.).

The view that there were two or more versions of *TC* published before the poem was finished are rejected. On the contrary B., basing his opinion on three passages not found in some mss. (cf. p. 170), holds "that the text goes back to Chaucer's own draft, where the passages were added in the margin or on loose slips." Thus careful copyists incorporated these revised readings, while the other mss. show the rejected readings copied by careless scribes (p. 171). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the *Astrolabe*. Since Lydgate (who was probably in a position to know) says that this treatise was written for the poet's son, Kittredge's "identification (viz. Clifford's son) appears very unlikely indeed" (p. 175 f.).

The chapter on "The Minor Poems" is a contribution in itself. Here Shirley comes into his own. *Fortune* is probably genuine. The Envoy to *Truth*, for insufficient reasons I think, B. believes spurious (for evidence that Chaucer knew Vache see "New Chaucer Items" in *MLN* Notes, xl, pp. 511 ff.). The concluding stanza of *Anelida and Arcite* is thought unChaucerian; obviously the *KT* is affected (p. 260). *The Complaint of Mars* probably refers (on the strength of Shirley) to a contemporary love affair. B. plausibly identifies the characters with Sir John Holland and the Duchess of York. *The Complaint of Pity* is colored by Dante and a sonnet of Petrarch (pp. 268 ff.). For the first time we have an exact reprint of *Womanly Noblesse*. The *Balade of a Reve* is probably by Chaucer. The *Proverbs* may owe something to Deschamps. On p. 286 there is noted a possible Bohemian literary influence on Chaucer. *Scogan* probably refers to John and not Henry, and is plausibly dated 1391 and not 1393 (289 ff.).

Chap. V on the *R. Rose* is an exhaustive monograph of 130 pp. Briefly his thesis is that Chaucer made a complete translation of the poem "a few years before 1380." "The garbled state of the text is mainly due to its having been handed down by a younger contemporary of Chaucer, who had to rely on his memory in doing so and who introduced several conscious as well as many unconscious changes. When his memory failed him he reproduced the text as best he might, sometimes with the assistance of the French poem. . . While it is impossible to give this reviser a name, his local habitation must have been the North Midlands" (p. 415; cf. p. 382). In short, the poem is not "made up from fragments of the work of several translators, but . . . the original version was rather handed down through failing memory" (p. 387).

The concluding chapter deals with lost and spurious works. *Maudeleyne* (a hypothetical stanza is given) presumably resembled *Seint Cecillie* (pp. 426 ff.). The *Book of the Lion* was probably inspired by Deschamps (p. 429). Several minor works are rejected (pp. 439 ff.). Skeat's *Clanvowe* and not Kittredge's candidate wrote *The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*. His evidence on this point seems conclusive. Though B. is probably right in taking the middle path on Chaucer's relations with Gaunt, it is well to remember that Thomas C. by 1389 was identified with this nobleman (cf. Ruud, *op. cit.*). B. thinks it "not unlikely" that Richard is to be identified with the God of Love in *LGW* (p. 448 n.).

Three appendices contain some of the most important material in the book. In A., Shirley and Lydgate are treated. Attention is directed in B. to the unsatisfactory state of Chaucer's text, and, though the dangers of emendation are noted, some good conjectures are made. In "Chaucer and Deschamps" (in C.) further borrowings from the French poet are given. The book ends with what is perhaps Brusendorff's most startling theory: "it is entirely unwarrantable to assume *two* occasions (as does Lowes, viz. 1386 and 1393), on which Clifford served as the literary messenger of Deschamps. We have got one reference, and one only, to such a mission; we cannot then gratuitously postulate that there really were two, occurring seven years apart, but under exactly similar conditions." Likewise Kittredge's belief that *Clanvowe's Book of Cupid* contains a reference to the daisy in *LGW* is rejected. Accordingly, Chaucer first saw Deschamps' poems in 1393. The two Prologues of the *LGW* are then to be dated 1393 and 1394 respectively.

This review, in spite of its length, has left untouched many significant matters. The references which have been checked up are correct, except one; P. 109, n. 2: for "*Eng. Stud.* 47. 84 ff." probably read "*Eng. Stud.* 47. 1 ff., espec. 30 ff." Unfortunately Root's

first edition was used. Brusendorff's style is admirable, and there is many a page of illuminating criticism. Finally, the volume should hasten the preparation of a critical edition of Chaucer. A good text, together with pertinent material now embedded in places only known to the sturdy specialist, is at present the greatest need; and until that is met the study of the poet will suffer all along the line.

ERNEST KUHLM.

Goucher College.

---

*Medieval Romance in England, A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-Cyclic Metrical Romances.* By LAURA A. HIBBARD, Ph. D. viii + 342 pp. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1924. \$3.50.

This excellent volume first took form as a Chicago doctor's dissertation, but its publication was deferred, wisely enough, from year to year, so that when it finally appeared it had become a product in every way worthy of the ripe, broad scholarship which we have learned to associate with its author. In her "Preface" Mrs. Loomis says, "The amount of intensive work that has been done on the individual non-cyclic romances and the lack of any comprehensive effort to summarize the results have led almost equally to the present undertaking. . . . Each romance is treated individually in a section, one part of which deals with *Versions*, and one with the *Origins* of the tale. Under *Versions* I have attempted to give something of a life history of each legend by listing all the literary versions which were composed before 1500, and by indicating so far as possible their relationship. In the section on *Origins* I have recorded the opinions of scholars on the historical and legendary elements that gave rise to the story and have tried to set forth the most important *motifs* which characterize the different versions. The *Index of Matters and Literature* at the close of the book is designed to coordinate this material and to reveal for these romances . . . the recurrent themes, the stock situations, characters, incidents, properties, the dominating conceptions, which mark the favorite patterns of medieval story-tellers as diverse in purpose and ability as the authors of these romances." The author modestly says nothing of her own original contributions, which are considerable, particularly in esthetic interpretation and evaluation.

The limitation indicated in the sub-title is adhered to perhaps too rigidly; thus, even a romance like *Sir Launfal* is excluded, although it can hardly be looked upon as cyclic except in a rather technical sense. But the author is doubtless wise in drawing the

line mechanically; if you don't draw it thus, you will have trouble drawing it at all! And by limiting herself in this fashion, the author has been enabled to do her work with a thoroughness, accuracy and intelligent discrimination highly creditable to herself and to American philology. Naturally, however, an undertaking so formidable as hers could not be carried out impeccably. I have gone through the chapter on *Havelok the Dane* with some care, and find several deficiencies of one sort or another. Thus, Kupferschmidt's discussion of the French versions is referred to, but no mention is made of J. Vising's study of the same matter in his *Etude sur le dialecte anglo-normand du XII. siècle*, although this study superseded that of Kupferschmidt. I miss from the bibliography A. Bugge's "Havelok og Olaf Tryggvesøn," *Aarbøger*, 1908, pp. 233 ff. In a note on p. 107 A. Olrik is said to have noted that the *Hrolfssaga* is connected but slightly with the *Havelok* legend but closely with *Meriudoc*. But Olrik took this observation (with due acknowledgments) from O. L. Olson's *Relation of Hrolfssaga . . . to Beowulf* (Chicago dissertation, 1916) and credit should go where it is due. The device of setting dead men up on stakes to deceive one's enemies is employed, not only in Saxo's story of Hamlet, but also in his story of Gram (ed. Holder, p. 17). A minute examination of other chapters might well reveal further blemishes. But if these are no more serious than the ones I have pointed out, Mrs. Loomis may safely be congratulated on having written a work of value and importance for the medieval philologist.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

KEMP MALONE.

---

*L'Appel de la route, par Edouard Estaunié*, edited by MARJORIE L. HENRY. Boston, Ginn, 1926. xxviii + 339 pp. \$1.56.

The many teachers who find it hard to thread their way through recent literature will welcome the guidance offered by a new series of texts, under the general editorship of Professor Morize, called *Contemporary France in Literature*. Duhamel, Estaunié, Guillaumin, and Pérochon will be more to their taste than a réchauffé of *M. Perrichon* or *le Petit Chose*. *L'Appel de la route*, the first of the volumes announced to appear, sets an excellent standard for the editions that are to follow. Miss Henry is well adapted to her task, for she combines with an unusual knowledge of French a personal acquaintance with M. Estaunié. One is not surprised to find an illuminating introduction and a well edited text. The absence of a vocabulary and the fact that only the most essential notes are given may injure the sale of the book and limit it to advanced students, but these are probably the readers that Miss H.

had in mind, for the haunting flavor of Estaurié's novels will mean little to those who are in their first and second year. Even for advanced students there may be too little action in this novel. *La Vie secrète* might have been, on this account, a better choice. But if the editor can make students appreciate the beauty of *l'Appel de la roue*, so much the greater credit will be due her. The notes are unusually good; I find few to criticize. On p. 1 we are told that "the French *collège* is under the direction of the State," yet on p. 2 we find that a man teaching in a school not under state control is a professor "au collège R." A *chiquenaude* is not a "snap of" (p. 49), but a blow with the finger, a filip. "Destroyed by" (p. 93) is an inexact translation of *que grignotent*. It is better to repeat a brief note than to give cross references (pp. 48, 50, 65, etc.), for the effect is not to save space, but to lose the reader's time. Such minor faults detract little, however, from the value of the edition, which I recommend to all teachers of French in American colleges.

H. C. L.

---

*The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama.* By HENRY TEN EyCK PERRY. New Haven (Yale University Press), 1925. xii+148 pp.

It is no news that scholars have re-discovered the Restoration drama. Most bookmen given to meddling with plays have always had a sneaking fondness for the lively pages of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve. Of late, however, stage managers have attempted the revival of certain pieces, mildly modified, since our taste has not yet quite advanced to the meridian of the lords and ladies who applauded the suggestive dialogue of the wits. Professor Nettleton, John Palmer, Allardyce Nicoll, and, more recently, Bonamy Dobrée have dealt learnedly with the makers of artificial comedy; and now comes Professor Perry of the University of Wisconsin, who, through the Yale Press, presents a suave discussion of *The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama*.

The title of this volume might seem to promise a philosophic consideration of varieties of the ludicrous in the plays of the period, but the phrase is here restricted to the very limited usage of George Meredith in his well-known essay. An introductory chapter speaks of theories of the comic but does so in only the most cursory fashion. Apparently, Professor Perry is not familiar with the survey in German by Gustav Jahn of the history of such theories; and he omits consideration of the doctrines of Emerson, Bergson, and Sidis, as well as of Freud and of Freud's latest English disciple, Professor Greig. Freud and Max Eastman he dismisses in a line, with the easy statement that, "the mind instinc-



tively flees from the jargon of psychology and takes refuge in the simplicity of classic philosophy." For Professor Perry, it is not the business of psychology and esthetics to trouble with the comic at all. But philosophy and George Meredith teach him that the comic spirit is an ally of common sense, sound reason, and fair justice; an unimpassioned perception of incongruities which shuns satire, on the one hand, and sentiment, on the other. Wit is the centre of its being, and it maintains a happy equilibrium of pleasure and pain as its mental concomitant. Really, the treatment of the comic spirit is here so meagre and superficial that the title of the volume turns out to be no more than an alluring if misleading label upon five collected essays concerned with five leading playwrights of the Restoration.

The essays themselves are excellent. They offer a detailed discussion of a score of comedies, not merely according to their exemplification of the comic spirit, but in general. Here are analyses of plots, indications of sources French and Spanish, comments upon the characters and the dialogue, and a careful placing of each playwright in the progress of the genre from burlesque and satire over to sentiment and that "Drama of Sensibility" concerning which Professor Bernbaum has written so winningly.

Of course, it is a heartless, godless world, this of Restoration comedy,—a world of fops, wits, and rakes, selfish and lawless, engaged in schemes to gratify their love or money-lust. All the cry is pleasure, as wives intrigue with gallants, husbands intrigue with other husbands' wives, or with ladies of the town, parents scheme profitable matches for the young, and youths hoodwink their parents. There is little thought and much smart talk, endless love-making and no true passion. It is a shallow, sensual, cynical society that is laughed at, sometimes savagely, as by Wycherley, more often with nonchalance, as by Congreve. By degrees sentiment and morality reassert themselves, at first but faintly, as in Vanbrugh's *Confederacy* and his counter-pictures of rustic virtue set over against urban vice, and then more obviously in Farquhar's ladies of feeling and his rakes susceptible of reform. In a literary way, this English comedy of four decades, from the days of Charles II to those of Queen Anne, was mainly influenced by Jonson at home and by Molière abroad; but it lacked the moral seriousness of Jonson or the bourgeois common sense of Molière. Jonson's comedy of humours was copied only in its externals, and Molière's humanity and universality were somehow lost in crossing the Channel. Yet, we may recognize, with Professor Perry, that "The Comedy of Manners is, prior to the modern Comedy of Ideas, the last and most brilliant effort of the laughing muse to resist the intrusions of the more serious concerns of existence"; and for this agreeable volume which describes and judges it so fairly we may be grateful.

*University of Cincinnati.*

FRANK W. CHANDLER.

*French Travellers in Greece (1770-1820). An Early Phase of French Philhellenism.* By EMILE MALAKIS. Philadelphia, 1925. University of Pennsylvania Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 15. 90 pp.

Le sous-titre de cet ouvrage en indique le véritable sujet. On n'y trouvera pas en effet une étude détaillée, ni même une vue superficielle et rapide des récits de voyages en Grèce écrits par des Français de 1770 à 1820. S'en tenant strictement aux limites d'un cadre assez étroit, M. Malakis n'a voulu retenir des relations qu'il a parcourues que l'opinion des auteurs sur les Grecs modernes. Il était cependant bien difficile ici de distinguer la Grèce moderne de la Grèce antique. Si nous laissons de côté le point de vue des purs politiques auquel nous n'avons pas à nous placer, il est incontestable que l'intérêt qui s'est manifesté en France pour la Grèce moderne, à la fin du dix-huitième et au commencement du dix-neuvième, était dû en grande partie à un "mirage antique" dont M. Malakis lui-même a bien été forcé de reconnaître l'existence puisqu'il a employé le terme. Il a négligé cependant de nous dire comment s'était formé ce mirage, de quels éléments il était composé, et d'en signaler les modifications graduelles et les transformations à mesure que l'on se rapproche de Chateaubriand et de Byron. Il en aurait été autrement si l'auteur avait repris la question de plus haut. A la fin du dix-septième siècle, Pitton de Tournefort qui parcourait les îles de la mer Egée, à la recherche d'inscriptions antiques et de nouveaux échantillons botaniques, n'a pour les Grecs modernes qu'un mépris à peine teinté de quelque indulgence et n'a un peu d'estime pour eux que parce qu'il regarde "le cerveau de ces pauvres Grecs comme autant d'inscriptions vivantes, lesquelles servent à nous conserver les noms citez par Théophraste et par Dioscoride." En d'autres termes, il ne retrouve entre eux et leurs prédécesseurs que le lien commun d'une langue qu'ils n'ont conservée que bien altérée et bien corrompue. Soixante ans plus tard, Guys, par qui M. Malakis commence son étude, voit dans la "Grèce moderne, couverte du long voile noir des esclaves, une mère captive, affligée." On perçoit toute la différence et tout le chemin qui a été parcouru, et il aurait été intéressant de rechercher comment cette transformation s'était produite. A Guys, selon M. Malakis un des initiateurs les plus marquants du mouvement philhellène, il ne consacre que quatre pages; il se borne à signaler "*the additions of a popular character on Greek dances and funerals which Madame Chénier contributed,*" alors que les lettres de Madame Chénier, d'ailleurs charmantes, même si elles ont "*a popular character,*" mettent en lumière chez les Grecs modernes cette survivance des mœurs antiques qui allait leur attirer tant de sympathies.

Par contre, si l'on accepte le point de vue de M. Malakis, on

trouvera chez lui une énumération intéressante et utile des récits de voyages en Grèce qui devaient contribuer à former cette atmosphère enfiévrée dans laquelle se développa le mouvement philhellène de 1820 à 1830. Il les a caractérisés de façon nette et précise, souvent trop brève à notre avis. Il a clairement montré la progression qui va de Guys à Chateaubriand, ne rencontrant guère sur sa route que deux auteurs, Jacques et André Grasset de Saint-Sauveur, qui fussent hostiles aux Grecs modernes. Les plus récents travaux sur *l'Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem* sont résumés de façon exacte et l'influence de l'ouvrage sur le mouvement philhellène est indiquée avec précision. Ici comme en tant d'autres cas, Chateaubriand est au centre même du carrefour d'où divergent tant de voies que devaient suivre les hommes de la génération suivante; mais je ne peux m'empêcher de croire que Chateaubriand était plus occupé de localiser le souvenir de ses lectures que de questions politiques pendant son grand pèlerinage. Pour lui, comme pour tous les Français d'alors, le philhellénisme était une question de sentiment et une question d'esthétique, et il reste fort regrettable que M. Malakis qui le sait mieux que personne, et qui mieux que personne était préparé pour traiter la question à fond, n'ait cru devoir lui faire qu'une place si minime. L'intérêt pour la Grèce moderne n'est qu'une manifestation du retour à l'antique que M. Louis Bertrand avait étudié dans sa thèse, une transformation de cet exotisme oriental dont M. Martino avait esquissé l'histoire. M. Malakis nous doit de reprendre son travail. Il a en mains tous les matériaux nécessaires: une documentation copieuse et exacte, une bibliographie abondante et une connaissance de la langue qui lui permettront, il faut l'espérer, de nous donner cette histoire du "sentiment grec" encore mal connu malgré les travaux particuliers dont il a été l'objet.

Il est fâcheux que les nombreuses indications bibliographiques contenues dans les notes n'aient pas été reprises de façon systématique à la fin du livre. L'omission du *Voyage* de Volney est curieuse; M. Malakis aurait pu également noter les traductions françaises de relations étrangères comme celle de Scrofani, *Voyage en Grèce*, fait en 1794 et 1795, publiée à Paris en 1801.

GILBERT CHINARD.

---

*Pearl. A Study in Spiritual Dryness.* By Sister M. MADELEVA, of the Congregation of the Holy Cross. D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1925.

Modern criticism of the *Pearl*, which has tended more and more to belittle the elegiac and emphasize the allegorical element in the poem, reaches its final stage in Sister Madeleva's book. The pro-

ponents of the allegorical interpretation, from the late Professor Schofield, who thought the Maiden of the vision symbolized "purity or clean maidenhood," to Professor W. K. Greene, who believes she represents "divine grace,"<sup>1</sup> have heretofore admitted that the poem was at least cast in the form of an elegy. As long as this admission is made, it is difficult to determine whether the Maiden is the poet's child, real or imagined, or someone else's, for this depends largely on one's estimate of the emotional intensity of the elegiac passages. Sister Madeleva goes one step further than these critics, and denies, not only that the *Pearl* is an elegy, but even that the poem is written in the form of an elegy. She calls it a spiritual autobiography. The Pearl child "represents the poet's own soul, as it might be in a state of perfection at this particular time of life" (p. 191).

In her first chapter, Sister Madeleva reviews and criticizes in spirited fashion the earlier interpretations of the poem. In the second chapter on "Spiritual Dryness," she proves the frequency of "interior desolation" as an experience in the lives of the mediaeval mystics; and in the third, entitled "Spiritual Backgrounds and Setting," she discusses the mystic's conception of the spiritual life, especially as illustrated in the works of fourteenth-century Englishmen. In the fourth and by far the longest chapter, Sister Madeleva reinterprets the *Pearl* stanza by stanza in the light of the writings of the mystic school. The argument in this section is evolved with acumen and ingenuity, and the book as a whole is well-planned and delightfully written.

The inevitability of a spiritual interpretation of the *Pearl* is more easily proved than the absurdity of the view that the poet is mourning or pretending to mourn the death of a child. All the passages that have hitherto been taken to refer to the death of the Pearl Maiden, Sister Madeleva endeavors to explain away, and interpret as spiritual autobiography. For example,

Flor & fryte may not be fede  
þer hit down drof in moldeȝ dunne;  
For vch gresse mot grow of graynez dede (29-31)

means (p. 101) that "from the death of every fault or imperfection arises the opposite virtue or perfection." The Maiden's remark:

For þat þou lesteȝ watȝ bot a rose,  
þat flowred & fayled as kynde hyt gef (269-70)

means (p. 134) that the loss of spiritual consolation in a religious is "but the withering flower of sensible devotion which does not affect at all the root of the devotion." The Poet's remark to the Maiden:

<sup>1</sup> *PMLA*. XL (1925), 814-27. Professor Greene's careful study, which contains an admirable critique of Schofield's view, hardly develops his own suggestion with sufficient thoroughness.

bou lyfed not two ȝer in oure þede;  
 þou cowþeȝ neuer God nauþer plese ne pray,  
 Ne neuer nawþer Pater ne Crede (483-5)

refers (pp. 158 ff.) to the "youth" of the religious, who has been only two years in a monastery, and whose ignorance of Pater and Creed indicate a spiritual infancy. When the Maiden says "When I wente fro yor worlde wete" (761), this does not imply death, but is (p. 175) "an expression regularly used to indicate entrance into the religious life." In every case, Sister Madeleva's explanation might be regarded as possible in varying degrees; but in every case, also, a strained and curious interpretation is substituted for the natural one, and the total impression is not favorable to the author's thesis.

It is harder to find passages where the allegorical interpretation fits better than that which presupposes personal bereavement. Sister Madeleva thinks (p. 133) that a man ingenious enough to write the *Pearl* would hardly conceal a daughter under such a ruse as "Ho watȝ me nerre þen aunte or nece" (233). But is not her own explanation, which implies that the Poet is speaking of his own soul, fantastic compared with the one she rejects? She finds the description of the Pearl "So rounde . . . So smal, so smope her sydeȝ were" (5-6) absurd, if they apply to a young girl (pp. 93, 96) as well as to a jewel. But she does not observe that the poet when he begins to describe the Maiden herself, actually uses two of the same adjectives: "So smope, so smal, so seme slyȝt" (190). He is deliberately reverting to the original description of the jewel in order to make the reader identify it with the Maiden.

Occasionally Sister Madeleva is guilty of logical inconsistency in her attempt to demonstrate the improbability of the traditional interpretation. On the Maiden's discourse concerning baptized children (625 ff.), she comments (pp. 169-70) "Here, among baptized children the poet should find his daughter or at least some reference to her, but there is absolutely none." Yet if one really interprets the poem as an elegy, the daughter is the Maiden speaking, and the whole context proves that she is of the company she describes; in fact, the only reason for mentioning baptized infants at all is because the Maiden is one herself. Sister Madeleva is here first reading an allegorical meaning into the passage, and then discovering difficulties in the traditional interpretation, not because it is intrinsically improbable, but simply because it fails to harmonize with her own explanation.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Compare her interpretation of line 271, p. 136, and her comment on "euentȝde," p. 167, which need not refer to age, spiritual or secular, but means simply that the Maiden came late to the Vineyard, in allusion to the parable cited.

Two erroneous assumptions seem to me to underlie the views expressed in the development of Sister Madeleva's thesis. One is that, if the poem is an elegy, it ought to be mournful in every line. This passage and that, the author writes, are not elegiac, as though this fact sufficed to prove the poem not an elegy. But neither is "Blind mouths" that scarce themselves know how to hold a sheep-hook" elegiac in tone. Yet it occurs in an elegy, and Milton, like the poet of the *Pearl*, preaches a sermon "by occasion." The *Pearl*, like all great elegies, rises above the mere record of grief. Another unnecessary assumption is that elegy and allegory are essentially incompatible. Professor Fletcher has shown (*JEGPh.* xx, 20-1) how false this dilemma is in the interpretation of the *Pearl* and of mediaeval literature generally, where facts may have a symbolic meaning above and beyond the literal, as every reader of Dante knows. Sister Madeleva's elaborate allegory is, of course, irreconcilable in its details with the hypothesis of elegy. But it is precisely her attempt to reject this hypothesis entirely and see allegory everywhere that makes of her book only a brilliant *tour de force*. On the other hand, for the considerable allegorical element in the *Pearl* which most scholars, even those who call the poem an elegy, now concede, Sister Madeleva's positive interpretation, less rigorously applied and more generally stated, is the best that has yet been propounded. There may well be represented in the *Pearl* the spiritual dejection of a man who regains through his vision of the Divine Grace that peace which passeth understanding. But however much of Sister Madeleva's work be finally accepted, every one interested in the *Pearl* must give her study careful consideration, for it is an original presentation by an incisive critic of a point of view natural to one trained in the traditions of Catholic mysticism.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

*Yale University.*

---

*The Essays of Montaigne.* Translated by GEORGE B. IVES. Introduction by GRACE NORTON. Four volumes, 397, 399, 347 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

The scholar, and the general reader also, who has not yet looked into the recent translation of Montaigne's *Essays* by George B. Ives, has distinct satisfaction and pleasure to which he may look forward. Here is a book readable, accurate, and furnished in addition with an abundance of information at once scholarly and appreciative. The interpretative comments by Miss Grace Norton preceding each essay serve the fine purpose of putting the reader into the right state of mind and feeling before he begins its perusal.

Aside from the faithfulness of the reproduction of Montaigne's

thought through translation, the feature of the book that will appeal most strongly to the serious student of Montaigne is the method applied throughout of indicating in the text itself of each essay the several portions belonging to the 1580, 1588 and 1595 editions of Montaigne's original work. This enables the critic with a minimum of effort to perceive that what at first may appear to him as an impossible inconsistency in the thought may be accounted for naturally enough as an opinion changed with the passing of the years. Montaigne of course would have been the first to laugh at us for insisting too literally on what the greatest of his American disciples more seriously terms the hobgoblin of little minds, yet even Montaigne would have preferred that his readers should get the impression from his works of a real rather than an apparent inconsistency. This one can now do.

The works of Strowski and of Pierre Villey, without going further, show how much water has run beneath the Montaigne mill since Cotton last translated the essays. Many results of their own research and of that of others are here set forth by Mr. Ives and Miss Norton. Of critical apparatus the volumes have a plenty.

The translation will be subjected to criticism from certain quarters for leaving untranslated certain "unprintable" portions of the *Essays*. A cursory survey, for example, of some three hundred pages of the third volume, will disclose the fact that about fifteen passages, totaling about five pages, are retained in the original French presumably on account of their obscenity in connection with sexual topics. Whether one is to approve or condemn this will depend in part on whether one takes the point of view of the general appreciative reader or the high ground of pure scholarship. One may judge by the general tone of the polite literature of to-day whether even the general reader would have been to any appreciable extent offended by the translation of the passages in question.

Now that the work is done, it is difficult to see how the student of any period of English literature since the third quarter of the sixteenth century can do without it. For the first of the essayists, if we may use the term in a literal sense rather than in the sense of genres of literature, began to have his effect upon English literature before his essays were first translated into English in 1603 and has continued to exert that influence in every century since. The names of those notable in English thought which show his influence would fill a page.

A few passages chosen at random from the original and their "englishing" by Florio, Cotton, and Ives, will show the superiority of the last translation over the former two:

Il est vray semblable que le principal credit des miracles, des visions, des enchantemens, et de tels effects extraordinaires, vienne de la puissance

de l'imagination agissant principalement contre les ames du vulgaire, plus molles. On leur a si fort saisi la creance qu'ils pensent voir ce qu'ils ne voyent pas.<sup>1</sup>—*Montaigne*.

It is very likely that the principall credit of visions, of enchantments, and such extraordinary effects, proceedeth from the power of imaginations, working especially in the mindes of the vulgar sort, as the weakest and secheest, whose conceit and beleefe is so seized upon, that they imagine to see what they see not.—*Florio*.

Tis very probable that visions, enchantments, and all extraordinary effects of that nature, derive their credit principally from the power of imagination, working as they do, and making their chiefeest impression upon vulgar and easy souls, whose belief is so full as to think they see what they do not.—*Cotton*.<sup>2</sup>

It is probable that the belief in miracles, enchantments, and such extraordinary matters, is due chiefly to the power of the imagination, acting principally on the minds of the common people, which are more easily impressed. Their credulity has been so strongly taken possession of, that they think they see what they do not see.—*Ives*.

La prudence si tendre et circonspecte, est mortelle ennemye de hautes executions.—*Montaigne*.<sup>3</sup>

A wisdom so tenderly precise, and so precisely circumspect, is a mortall enemy to haughty executions.—*Florio*.

This over-circumspect and wary prudence is a mortal enemy to all high and generous exploits.—*Cotton*.

Prudence, so sensitive and so circumspect, is the mortal enemy of lofty actions.—*Ives*.

Tres-plaisante à veoir quand le temps commence à en effacer la souvenance, et tres à propos pour nous oster souvent de peine: quand fut entamée telle besoigne? quand achevée? quels trains y ont passé? combien arresté? noz voyages, noz absences, mariages, morts, la reception des heureuses ou malencontreuses nouvelles; changement des serviteurs principaux; telles matieres.—*Montaigne*.<sup>4</sup>

A thing very pleasant to read, when time began to weare out the remembrance of them, and fit for us to passe the time withall, and to resolve some doubts: when such a worke was begun, when ended, what way or course was taken, what accidents hapened, how long it continued; all our voyages, where, and how long we were from home; our marriages, who died, and when; the receiving of good or bad tidings, who came, who went, changing or removing of household officers, taking of new, or discharging of old servants, and such like matters.—*Florio*.

Very pleasant to look over when time begins to wear things out of memory, and very useful sometimes to put us out of doubt, when such a thing was begun, when ended, what courses were debated on, what concluded; our voyages, absences, marriages, and deaths, the reception of good or ill news, the change of principal servants, and the like.—*Cotton*.

Very pleasant to look over when time begins to efface the remembrance of these things, and often very convenient to save us trouble: when such a work was entered upon; when finished; what great personages came to us, how long they remained; our journeys; our absences; marriages;

<sup>1</sup> *Essays de Montaigne*, Pierre Villey, I, 124.

<sup>2</sup> Edition of O. W. Wright, New York, 1864.

<sup>3</sup> *Essays de Montaigne*, Pierre Villey, I, 163.

<sup>4</sup> *Essays de Montaigne*, Pierre Villey, I, 289.



deaths; the receipt of good or bad news; changings of the principal servants—such matters.—*Ives*

Something should be said concerning the desirability of this edition as a superb specimen of modern printing. The Harvard Press, has recently contributed greatly to the number of publications which are distinguished for their manufacture as well as for their contents. With this translation, Montaigne becomes indeed an English classic, presented in a form worthy of his master.

*University of North Carolina.*

G. C. TAYLOR.

---

*Gehalt und Form.* Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Literaturwissenschaft und zur allgemeinen Geistesgeschichte, Von ROBERT PETSCH. 8vo. 572 pp.

This volume is the first number of Series II: Untersuchungen. Hamburgische Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Philologie, herausgegeben von Conrad Borchling, Robert Petsch, Agathe Lasch. Dortmund, 1925. Verlag von Fr. Wilh. Ruhfus.

Under the title *Gehalt und Form*, Professor Petsch, of the University of Hamburg, has gathered together a series of his *Kleine Schriften*, all of which have been published before, but scattered in places not easily accessible. The study called *Chor und Volk im antiken und modernen Drama* appeared as early as 1904, *Der mittellateinische Militarius, Magierszenen aus einem lateinischen Schuldrama*, and *Das holländische Faustdrama*, in 1908, but most under the rubrics II. *Zur Theorie des Tragischen*, III. *Faustsage und Faustdichtung*, and IV. *Aus der Welt des deutschen Idealismus*, is the product of the years 1917 to 1923.

The question, what continuity in so wide a range of subjects?—is ably answered in an introduction *Zur Einführung*, a survey of the author's progressive education, a confession of the aims of his intellectual life. This personal note contributes a charming human touch to the tense intellectuality of the book.

The classics were the center of education in the early nineties at the Sophiengymnasium, without becoming "threatening tyrants over the whole." Entering the University of Berlin with the intention of becoming a classical philologist, Petsch soon became aware of the limitations of mere linguistic study. *Wirkliche Lebenswerte* he found in the lectures of the immortal Curtius, and the museum talks of the original Kekulé. Who could refrain from catching the spark from the divine fire of Treitschke and Dilthey? Weinhold, succeeding the Grimms, expounded *Volkskunde* and mythology. Erich Schmidt drew him irresistibly to German litera-

ture ("dessen hinreissende Darstellungsgebe jeden Abschnitt der Literaturgeschichte geniessbar zu machen wusste"). The coming of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff awakened a new faith in the Greek drama. The study of the tragedy appeared fundamental. Volkskunde, Kulturgeschichte, Völkerpsychologie, Philologie, Aesthetik, Erlebnis, Weltanschauung,—from which view-point should literature be studied? This battle of souls, not of books, the scholar carried with him, to Würzburg, Heidelberg, Liverpool, and back home, finally creating for himself the formula: "Volkskunde und Religionsgeschichte mit der Erforschung des deutschen Idealismus, Studien über die dramatische Form mit der Beobachtung dichterisch-künstlerischer Sprachbehandlung." This method of approach was adopted in the author's recent edition of Goethe's *Faust*, and is evident as well in the volume before us. It demonstrates the unity between such seemingly divergent subjects as *Zwei Pole des Dramas* at the beginning, and *Goethes Stellung zur Unsterblichkeitsfrage* at the close of the volume. Still, the impression given is not so much that of brilliant versatility, as that of a sincere attempt to deal with essentials, and get at the root of the matter. We are very grateful to Professor Petsch for placing before us in such convenient form, the results of recent German scholarship on some of the most important questions that face the student of Germanics.

Cornell University.

A. B. FAUST.

*Rousseau and the Poetry of Nature in Eighteenth Century France.*

By RICHARD ASHLEY RICE. Northampton, Smith College; Paris, Champion, Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, vol. VI, Nos. 3 and 4, April and July, 1925. 96 pp.

Reprenant une question maintes fois débattue, M. Rice a essayé de situer Rousseau dans le courant de la littérature pastorale, en étudiant le sentiment de la nature chez ses prédécesseurs et chez ses successeurs, et en prenant *la Nouvelle Héloïse* comme centre de son travail. L'auteur, partant de la poésie pastorale de la Renaissance en retrace rapidement le développement jusqu'à *l'Astrée*, et montre comment, après une éclipse de plus d'un siècle le roman pastoral modifié, la bergerie étant devenue un tableau de la vie simple, a retrouvé une nouvelle vogue. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre et Chateaubriand continuent Rousseau, avec une palette plus riche, mais sont en somme dans la même tradition de la pastorale. C'est une thèse qui peut être défendue et que M. Rice défend avec habileté, souvent avec vraisemblance et une documentation fort riche. On trouvera dans son travail des aperçus ingénieux et on le lira avec profit même après M. Mornet, M. Seillières et M. Babbitt, pour ne citer que les auteurs à qui il doit le plus. Il m'est impossible ici d'entrer dans le détail de l'exposé de M. Rice. On y re-

marque cependant une omission singulière. Je m'accorde entièrement avec le jugement que porte l'auteur sur les descriptions de la nature que l'on peut trouver dans *la Nouvelle Héloïse*; en un sens, elles sont traditionnelles, pauvres en couleur et imprécises. Après les avoir analysées l'auteur a beau jeu pour partir sur le thème moral et pour analyser la valeur de la conception rousseauvienne non de la nature extérieure, mais de la nature morale. Il tombe ainsi dans la faute commune à tous ceux qui, voulant parler de Rousseau, refusent de le considérer dans sa complexité et sa variété et le jugent comme l'homme *unius libri*. Si le Rousseau de *la Nouvelle Héloïse* continue la tradition de *l'Astrée*, on n'en peut dire autant du Rousseau de certaines pages des *Confessions* et de celui de la *Cinquième* et de la *Septième Promenade*. M. Rice n'en parle cependant qu'en passant (p. 48) et y trouve le même vague et la même attitude que dans les descriptions de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*. La thèse ou moins en est absente et la "bergerie" n'y paraît guère. Dans un dernier chapitre intitulé Rousseau, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre et Chateaubriand, on trouvera des notations justes sur le style des trois auteurs; mais ici encore, je rappellerai que c'est dans *Une nuit chez les sauvages de Niagara*, plutôt que dans *Atala* qu'il convient de chercher l'influence directe et éclatante de Rousseau et que, si Chateaubriand a condamné Rousseau dans une phrase citée par M. Rice et qui se trouve dans la préface de la première édition d'*Atala*, son attitude a été toute autre dans *l'Essai sur les Révolutions*.

GILBERT CHINARD.

---

*Increase Mather, The Foremost American Puritan.* By KENNETH BALLARD MURDOCK. Harvard University Press, 1925.

If it has seemed to many students of American literature that its early historians gave disproportionate attention to the writings of the Puritan clergy and particularly to the dynasty of the Mathers, there is perhaps the more justification for a detailed and fully documented biography of the greatest of those learned divines. For Dr. Murdock, besides throwing light upon the Boston of the era of *The Scarlet Letter*, gives us a full-length portrait of Increase Mather, tracing his lineage and recording his activities at Harvard, as student and as president, his service of the colony of England, his association with the witchcraft delusion, and his ultimate decline in influence. He thus makes possible a more just estimate of the man and his class.

This estimate modifies some modern judgments of Increase Mather, who has been too little known, and whose reputation has been dimmed by the contemporary laudation of his son, Cotton Mather. Dr. Murdock does not, like some contemporary biographers, strive merely to lay bare the soul of his subject; he writes

on the defensive and is obviously and frankly partisan. He pleads with us to judge Mather in his own time and place "delighting in the fresh green of Snow Hill, breathing the clear air of a country seaport," rather than by the standards of "our own Boston with its smoke, noise, crowds, foreign languages, and liberty measured by modern tests." So judged, he is, according to his biographer, "unquestioned leader in his own country and his own time," a good scholar, an able writer, broad-minded, intellectually alert, essentially a great man.

From so loyal a portrayal one is reluctant to dissent; but it is difficult to avoid an impression that Dr. Murdock protests too much. It is clear that Mather was a leader in the colony whose diplomatic services have been underestimated; that he and his class were sadly deficient in humor and breadth of mind, moving in their isolated sphere with the solemn gravity of children playing a game and growing more rigidly narrow as the century progressed, seems still a not unjust judgment.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson.* Arranged and Compiled with an Introduction by JOSEPH EPES BROWN. Princeton University Press, 1926. Pp. lxxvi, 551. \$7.50.

"That all compilations are useless I do not assert," said Dr. Johnson. . . "Writers of extensive comprehension have incidental remarks upon topics very remote from the principal subject, which are often more valuable than formal treatises, and which yet are not known. . . He that collects those under proper heads is very laudably employed, for, though he exerts no great abilities in the work, he facilitates the progress of others." There can be no question that Mr. Brown has facilitated the progress of others, that he has made it possible to turn immediately to material which the layman would never find and part of which would probably escape the specialist even after a considerable search. Furthermore, Johnson is so typical a figure that students who are not directly concerned with him or with criticism may find the book useful.

It consists of Dr. Johnson's critical opinions, oral and written, divided into two nearly equal parts, "Principles of Criticism" and "Authors and Works." The first part is elaborately subdivided under some three hundred heads such as, to take a single letter, "Iambic, Idyl, Imagery, Imagination, Imitation, Inspiration, Invention, Italian Literature, Italian Opera." The work is carefully done, the mistakes seem to be few and the omissions fewer,—the remark to Miss Seward that "he would hang a dog

that read the *Lycidas* twice" is not included. Yet, large as the book is, it does not include all of Johnson's critical utterances since the essays and longer passages are necessarily summarized. Furthermore, the cross-references, though numerous, are by no means complete so that the reader does not have before him all the Doctor's expressed opinions on a given subject and sometimes not all the important ones.

Aside from a number of excellent foot-notes, Mr. Brown's comments on his material are limited to the forty pages of his Introduction which, though interesting, well written, and in general sound, is not searching and is by no means so thorough or so good as Mr. Percy Houston's treatment of the same subject in *Dr. Johnson, a Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism*, to which no reference is made. By falling into a common misconception of neo-classicism, so definite and rigid that it does not fit any important writer of the period, Mr. Brown is driven towards the conclusion that Johnson was not a neo-classicist. But if he was not who, save Rymer, was? As to the rules, the attack on them began before Johnson was born. Then again, by ignoring fundamental differences in spirit, attitude, emphasis, and method, Mr. Brown finds the criticism of Young and the Wartons—who were, to be sure, but mild and gentle radicals—much more like Johnson's than it really is. Yet he does well in calling attention to the less rigid side of Johnson's neo-classicism and to the classic side of his more romantic contemporaries.

The book is attractively printed on good paper and is bound uniformly with the Johnson Letters and Miscellanies as well as the Letters of Boswell. So far as I recall, it is the most elaborate presentation of the critical utterances of any English writer.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

*De l'Amour.* Par DESTUTT DE TRACY avec une introduction de GILBERT CHINARD. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles-Lettres," 1926. lvii + 81 pp.

Il y avait un petit problème en suspens, bien connu des stendhaliens: d'une part, Destutt de Tracy avait laissé inachevé le chapitre *De l'Amour* qui termine ses *Eléments d'idéologie*; et d'autre part, Stendhal parle d'une traduction italienne de ce chapitre. "L'auteur," écrit en effet Stendhal dans son propre livre *De l'Amour*, au chapitre 58, "l'auteur avait lu un chapitre intitulé *Dell' Amore* dans la traduction italienne de *l'Ideologie* de M. de Tracy." Comment concevoir la traduction italienne d'un ouvrage dont l'original n'existait pas?

C'est ici qu' est intervenu M. Chinard. Il s'est d'abord assuré

que Destutt de Tracy avait écrit, non pas seulement les quelques pages tronquées qui terminent les *Eléments d'idéologie*, mais un chapitre entier intitulé *De l'Amour*. On trouve dans une lettre de Destutt de Tracy à Jefferson, à la date du 22 février 1821 : "Je serais bien aise que l'on joignît à ces premiers chapitres le second qui traite de l'amour. Je n'en ai imprimé dans l'édition française que les premières lignes, mais il est fait tout entier depuis longtemps, et si je ne l'ai pas publié, c'est par une sorte de timidité de faire confidence entière à tout ce qui m'entoure de mes sentiments les plus secrets sur certains objets." On est sûr, après cela, et de l'existence du manuscrit, et de la raison pour laquelle Destutt de Tracy ne l'a pas fait imprimer en France.

A défaut du manuscrit lui-même, qui a malheureusement disparu, restait à trouver la traduction italienne dont parle Stendhal : c'est ce que M. Chinard a fait, en second lieu. Il a remis au jour le chapitre *De l'Amour*, devenu *dell' Amore*, qu'on peut lire dans les *Elementi d'ideologia del Conte Destutt di Tracy . . . per la prima volta pubblicati in italiano con prefazione e note dal Cav. Compagnoni. Parte quinta ossia trattato della Volontà e dei suoi effetti. Diviso in tre volumi. . . Vol. III. Milano, 1819. Giuseppe Compagnoni*, surtout connu par une composition du genre funèbre à l'imitation des *Nuits* d'Young, et qui s'appelle *Le Veglie del Tasso*,<sup>1</sup> fut un traducteur abondant. Partisan décidé des Français à l'époque de la République cisalpine, il dut se réfugier à Paris quand les Autrichiens réoccupèrent les provinces lombardo-vénitiennes, en 1799-1800. Est-ce alors qu'il connut Destutt de Tracy, et ce groupe des Idéologues dont l'œuvre devait avoir en Italie des répercussions encore mal connues, mais certaines ?

M. Chinard a traduit en français la traduction italienne de Compagnoni : l'édition qu'il nous donne représente donc la pensée de Destutt de Tracy, non pas son texte exact. Il y a joint le plus substantiel commentaire, où il étudie l'origine des idées de Tracy sur l'amour ; où il délimite exactement leur influence sur Stendhal ; où il suit leur répercussion. La question s'amplifie, en effet ; elle dépasse la petite curiosité stendhalienne qui l'avait d'abord provoquée, et qui est désormais satisfaite. Elle s'étend à tout un aspect de la psychologie française. M. Chinard avait déjà révélé la puissance de la tradition exotique en France : il veut mesurer maintenant la puissance de ce courant souterrain qui s'appelle l'idéologie, et qui, sous le romantisme, réunit l'analyse du dix-huitième siècle au positivisme du dix-neuvième. Nul doute que cette seconde enquête, menée par lui, ne donne les plus heureux résultats : après *Jefferson et les Idéologues*, le présent ouvrage en est la preuve.

Collège de France.

PAUL HAZARD.

<sup>1</sup> Voir Enzo Palmieri, *Ciurmeria romantica sul Tasso*, dans le *Marzocco* du 23 août 1925.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

November, 1926

Number 7

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHIE CRITIQUE DE JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU DANS LES CINQ DERNIÈRES ANNÉES<sup>1</sup>

Le plus simple sera de rattacher cette bibliographie collective à notre étude: *Le Mouvement Rousseauiste du Dernier Quart de Siècle* (Modern Philology, xx). Le mouvement ne s'est pas ralenti. On peut dire que, proportionnellement, et si l'on considère les ouvrages du point de vue de la valeur documentaire, ces cinq dernières années ont donné des travaux auxquels bien peu dans le passé sont supérieurs ou même comparables. Nous avons terminé par la mention des œuvres capitales de C. E. Vaughan,<sup>2</sup> et Pierre-Maurice Masson.<sup>3</sup> Or le même esprit de patiente, mais intelligente et pénétrante et consciencieuse recherche, se retrouve et s'affirme de plus en plus et la vérité en bénéficie. C'est à l'heure même où paraissait notre étude que mourait Théophile Dufour (13 nov. 1922) et cette mort constitue une date dans l'histoire des études rousseauistes. Ce Genevois, autrefois directeur des Archives de Genève, savant dont la minutie était telle qu'on parlait de lui comme de "M. Dufour qui n'a jamais commis d'erreur," avait donné cinquante années de son existence à des travaux presque exclusivement consacrés à Rousseau; il était mort cependant n'ayant publié qu'une très minime fraction de ses travaux; il était

<sup>1</sup> Théophile Dufour, Pierre-Paul Plan, Albert Schinz, Alexis François, Louis J. Courtois, Fred. A. Pottle, André Monglond, M. Gillet, L. Proal, Daniel Mornet, G. R. Havens, Servais Etienne, Hippolyte Buffenoir, C. A. Fusil, Fr. Waterhouse, Ernest Seillière, Irving Babbitt, M. Carrière, Jacques Maritain, V. Giraud, Francisque Vial, A. O. Lovejoy, Richard Ashley Rice, Gilbert Chinard.

<sup>2</sup> *Political Writings of Rousseau.*

<sup>3</sup> *La Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard* et *La Religion de J.-J. Rousseau.*

du pays d'Amiel . . . par scrupule, il n'avait pu se décider. Cette œuvre formidable est maintenant éditée peu à peu, par les soins de M. Pierre-Paul Plan, un bibliographe lui-même de la meilleure réputation. En moins de quatre ans, il a déjà mis au jour six respectables volumes dont chacun vaut presque son poids d'or, deux de *Recherches Bibliographiques*, et quatre de *Correspondance*; et il n'en est qu'au début. Outre la *Correspondance* (qui va encore représenter une quinzaine de volumes au moins), il compte donner une édition des *Confessions*. Ajoutons tout de suite que le travail de P.-P. Plan est très souvent une œuvre de collaboration autant que d'édition.

Le titre complet du premier ouvrage explique déjà assez le contenu: *Recherches Bibliographiques sur les Œuvres Imprimées de J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris, L. Giraud-Badin, 1925, 2 vol. in 8; xi + 273; 297 pp.). Plus précisément encore, ces premiers mots de l'Introduction indiquent l'idée de l'ouvrage:

La Bibliographie des œuvres de Jean-Jacques Rousseau est à peu près inconnue. Sans doute, on n'ignore pas les dates de publication de ses principaux livres, bien que même sur ce terrain restreint, il se glisse des erreurs singulières dans tous les traités et manuels d'histoire littéraire, mais la détermination de l'édition originale—celle dont J.-J. Rousseau a revu les épreuves—l'identification des contrefaçons, souvent nombreuses, l'indication des changements apportés par l'auteur dans des éditions subséquentes, tout ce travail si utile pour l'intelligence de la *Correspondance*, pour l'établissement du texte dans une édition critique, personne ne l'a entrepris. (VII).

Plan ajoute deux exemples typiques de l'utilité du travail; l'un est celui de Bosscha, qui publie les *lettres de Rousseau à Rey* (1858), et croit avoir sous les yeux les éditions *principes* de Rey, quand en réalité il n'a parfois que des contrefaçons. Importants sont encore ces mots:

On verra que si certains chapitres sont traités avec une grande richesse de détails, certains autres sont encore, en comparaison, à l'état d'esquisse. Il eût été possible, au prix de beaucoup de temps et de recherches, de donner à ces derniers plus d'ampleur; mais je n'ai pas voulu qu'on attendît davantage. (IX).

C'est exact; quelquefois les données sont très riches, quelquefois à compléter. La table des matières renseignera jusqu'à un certain point d'avance. Les œuvres sont rangées par ordre chronologique.



À la fin du premier volume il y a un chapitre: "Ouvrages faussement attribués à J.-J. Rousseau" (p. ex. la *lettre à l'Archevêque d'Auch* et les *Letters of an Italian Nun*). On trouve énumérés quelques recueils de lettres, des ouvrages édités par Rousseau (*La Serva Padrona*). L'utilité de ces volumes est, cela va de soi, énorme. Quand on a entre les mains un écrit de Rousseau, il suffira la plupart du temps de se rapporter au numéro correspondant des *Recherches Bibliographiques*. Pour donner un exemple concret, le travail de Dufour réduirait aujourd'hui à deux ou trois pages les pages 35 à 59 de notre brochure: *La Collection Jean-Jacques Rousseau de la Bibliothèque de J. Pierpont-Morgan* (Smith College Studies, VII, 1, Oct., 1925). Non pas que tous les problèmes soient résolus, mais les données qu'on possède sur les problèmes bibliographiques sont là; ainsi, nous aurions pu y renvoyer pour le problème de l'édition originale du *Premier discours*, N<sup>o</sup>. II, ss. (Dufour, p. 44 ss.); et le problème de notre numéro III, *Devin de Village*, est expliqué au numéro 35 de Dufour (p. 45 ss.). D'autre part, pour son chapitre sur la *Lettre à d'Alembert* I, 71 ss. Dufour-Plan aurait pu trouver quelques matériaux dignes d'emploi, ou au moins de citation, dans Ayers, *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVII,—mais les travaux d'Amérique n'avaient pas trouvé grâce encore auprès de M. Dufour. De même dans la liste au vol. II, *Livres ayant appartenu à Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, II, 80 ss., M. Plan trouvera dans notre brochure trois numéros à ajouter à ses 25.

Parfois (et personne ne protestera) M. Dufour introduit des renseignements complémentaires p. ex., p. 38, un catalogue de 22 pièces relatives à la "Querelle des Bouffons," et qui est contenu dans un recueil du British Museum (in 8<sup>o</sup>, cote 1103. b. 21). On verra, p. 34, à propos d'un passage de Poulet-Malassis, *Querelle des Bouffons*, 1876, p. 23, no. 6, un exemple de la minutieuse cruauté critique de Dufour. Le deuxième volume contient un catalogue des éditions collectives (80 p.), et ce qui est surtout précieux un *Inventaire des papiers de Rousseau conservés à la Bibl. de Neuchâtel*. pp. 101-297. On est étonné que cette bibliothèque n'ait pas fait cette publication elle-même, ayant eu des hommes de grande valeur comme bibliothécaires. Mais nous n'avons qu'une chose à constater: on possède aujourd'hui ce catalogue. Cependant, là encore M. Dufour malgré son énorme savoir ne sait ou ne

consigne pas tout. Nous comparerions son volume au *Manuel Bibliographique* de Lanson pour la littérature depuis le seizième siècle: ouvrages à consulter avant tous les autres, d'une richesse énorme, mais n'épuisant pas nécessairement la matière et même parfois souffrant des corrections.

*La Correspondance Générale de J.-J. Rousseau*, également publiée par P.-P. Plan (A. Colin, 1924 ss.), en est à son 4<sup>ème</sup> volume. Cet événement capital de l'histoire du Rousseauisme a été suffisamment annoncé pour que nous puissions être brefs.\* Qu'il suffise de rappeler que jusqu'ici on dépendait toujours encore des ré-éditions de Musset-Pathay, et surtout de l'édition Hachette; à cela s'ajoutait une série de recueils spéciaux, Bosscha, Ritter, Buffenoir, Godet, François etc. *La Correspondance Générale* incorpore naturellement tout cela et en outre toutes les lettres isolées publiées çà et là dans des revues et journaux; enfin on ajoute un bon nombre de lettres inédites jusqu'ici. En tout, il y en aura dans les 3000. N'oublions pas de dire que l'éditeur ajoute souvent des réponses de correspondants (au tome 4 il y en a presque plus que de Rousseau même); et il ne faut pas s'étonner si, en ce point, la méthode est un peu vacillante. A mettre toutes les réponses cela ferait une publication mastodonte; il convenait d'admettre plutôt celles-là seulement dont l'accès était moins facile, ou qui étaient éparpillées dans trop de revues différentes. Pour les notes c'est la même chose; on ne pouvait pas tout annoter, souligner tout; il fallait user d'un certain tact littéraire pour prendre le nécessaire. M. Plan est particulièrement soucieux—après Dufour—de donner des textes absolument sûrs, et il n'est peine qu'il ne prenne pour aboutir. On compte qu'il y aura une vingtaine de volumes. L'impression est très belle—en tout, digne de l'importance de la publication. Des quatre volumes qui ont paru, le premier va jusqu'en 1751, le 2<sup>ème</sup> jusqu'en 1756 (avec index pour vol. 1 et 2), le 3<sup>ème</sup> jusqu'en 1758, le 4<sup>ème</sup> est pour les années 58 et

\* Voir p. ex. pour l'Amérique, notre article du *New York Times Sunday Book Review*, 11 jan. 1925, et dans *M. P.*, Nov. 1925, *L'Affaire de la Correspondance Générale de Rousseau et la Société J.-J. Rousseau*. Trop tard pour en tenir compte, nous avons reçu le Tome V de la *Correspondance*. Il s'agit surtout de l'impression de la *Nouvelle Héloïse* et il y a environ 120 pièces inédites, pas de Rousseau cependant, le début, aussi, de sa correspondance avec Mme de Verdelin.

59. Nous en sommes à la fin de la *Lettre sur les Spectacles*, avec déjà un très grand nombre de lettres se rapportant à la *Nouvelle Héloïse*. Tous les épisodes de la vie de Rousseau défilent à nouveau devant nous, et précis, sinon toujours éclairés de lumières nouvelles; Rousseau et Mme de Warens, Venise, les vagabondages et les soucis de l'existence matérielle, l'affaire Palissot, les Encyclopédistes, l'Ermitage et Mont-Louis. Même les plus impénitents des Rousseau-phobes devront reconnaître que Rousseau sort tout à son honneur de l'épreuve jusqu'ici. Il a des lubies, des sautes d'humeur, des soupçons mal fondés (encore que souvent bien naturels), etc., mais aucune bassesse et des traits vraiment beaux d'un homme probe et juste. Un exemple tiré d'une lettre à Deleyre: Deleyre est un petit personnage, Rousseau n'a pu songer en écrivant que sa lettre devînt jamais publique; on ne saurait donc en nier la sincérité. Or Deleyre avait probablement fait quelque sortie contre Helvétius de la coterie philosophique, en pensant ainsi faire plaisir à Rousseau. Rousseau lui répond:

Il est vrai, M. Helvétius a fait un livre dangereux et des retractations humiliantes. Mais il a quitté la place de fermier-général, il a fait la fortune d'une honnête fille, il s'attache à la rendre heureuse, il a dans plus d'une occasion soulagé les malheureux: ses actions valent mieux que ses écrits. Mon cher Deleyre, tâchons d'en faire dire autant de nous. Adieu, je vous embrasse de tout mon cœur.

C'est le même Rousseau qui veut réhabiliter Palissot, lequel avait des ennuis à cause d'une attaque contre le philosophe de la nature, et qui souvent défend contre des sots, Voltaire son grand ennemi.

Des éléments de correspondance Rousseau sont publiés aussi par Alexis François,<sup>5</sup> matériaux qui seront en leur temps incorporés naturellement dans la *Correspondance Générale*. De même les deux lettres publiées par M. Courtois dans la *Semaine Littéraire* de Genève,<sup>6</sup> et les six lettres inédites (nous avons dit par méprise *sept*) dans la première partie de notre brochure, citée plus haut.

Notons ici un article remarquable de N. Roger (Mme Pittard) dans *R. d. D. M.*, 1 juin 1925, pp. 650-79, inspiré par le troisième volume de la *Corr. Gen.*<sup>7</sup> Remarquons en passant que c'est la

<sup>5</sup> *Matériaux pour la Correspondance de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, Hachette, 1923, in-8, 152 p.

<sup>6</sup> 30 mai 1925 "Rousseau et les Davenport."

<sup>7</sup> *Sur J.-J. Rousseau et les drames de l'Ermitage*.

première fois que cette revue publie un article où sont reconnus enfin comme indiscutables, les résultats des révélations Macdonald sur la falsification par Diderot et Grimm des Mémoires d'Epinay. Mme Rogers dessine impitoyablement la faible Mme d'Epinay dominée par Grimm. Femme elle-même, Noëlle Roger est du reste—ne nous en étonnons pas outre mesure—d'une sévérité extrême pour les femmes. Voici pour les trois pour qui Rousseau a eu de la tendresse. "Après la médiocre baronne de Warens, dit-elle, p. 659, la médiocre comtesse d'Houdetot. Et pendant toute sa vie, Thérèse qui n'a cessé de le trahir." A quand le coup de griffe à Mme de Luxembourg et à Mme de Boufflers?

Venons maintenant aux publications ayant trait à la vie de Rousseau. Elles sont toujours importantes, car on sait bien qu'à tort ou à raison, l'homme Rousseau a toujours sollicité l'attention autant que l'écrivain. Le travail le plus considérable,—pas par le nombre de pages, mais par les longues et minutieuses études qui l'ont rendu possible,—est celui de Louis J. Courtois.<sup>8</sup> M. Courtois suit, jour par jour, Rousseau de sa naissance à sa mort, et il accompagne chaque date de références bibliographiques; un travail qui sera des plus précieux pour permettre d'établir très rapidement les éléments de toutes recherches ultérieures; il dirigera vers les principales sources de renseignements; souvent il évitera à l'étudiant de s'engager dans des voies qui l'égareraient. Toutes ses dates sont-elles définitives? Non; l'auteur ne le prétend pas. N'y a-t-il même d'erreurs dans aucun des chiffres considérés comme certains? Qui voudrait en être sûr? En tous cas c'est une mise au point admirable de cette vie de Rousseau si difficile à connaître avec exactitude, et la Société J.-J. Rousseau n'aurait pu nous donner un travail plus utile.

Comme études sur des périodes de la vie de Rousseau, il faut citer le charmant petit volume de M. Alexis François.<sup>9</sup> Par ces pages minutieusement documentées sur le séjour de Rousseau à Yverdon (avant d'aller à Motiers), on se rendra compte mieux que dans maints gros volumes, combien étaient âpres les colères

<sup>8</sup> *Chronologie Critique de la Vie et des Œuvres de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, paru dans les *Annales Rousseau*, Vol. xv, 1923, 366 pp.

<sup>9</sup> *J.-J. Rousseau et leurs Excellences*, dans la collection "Vieille Suisse," Lausanne, 1924, 109 p., avec 11 gravures hors texte.

protestantes contre Rousseau et aussi avec quel zèle de nobles esprits l'ont défendu. A cette occasion, on sera frappé de constater quelle société de gens intéressants et cultivés on pouvait trouver alors (des magistrats comme le bailli de Gingins-Moiry, ou des particuliers comme les Roguin) même dans de toutes petites villes comme Yverdun.

Du même M. François un pastiche très habile (si habile que beaucoup y ont été pris) décrivant sous forme de fragments d'un journal rédigé pendant les années 1752-55, par François de Luc le séjour de Rousseau à Genève en 1755.<sup>10</sup> La famille de Luc fut, dès les premiers jours, très amie de Rousseau, et lui resta fidèle durant les orages provoqués à Genève par *l'Emile et le Contrat Social*, et racontés par Ed. Rod.<sup>11</sup>

F. A. Pottle, de Yale, a publié quelques documents très intéressants.<sup>12</sup> Entre autres choses, il croit avoir retrouvé dans le *St. James Chronicle*, deux lettres de Walpole contre Rousseau dans la genre facétieux de la prétendue lettre du Roi de Prusse: "Choisissez-les [des malheurs] tels que vous voudrez; je suis roi et je puis vous en procurer au gré de vos souhaits. . . ." Il faut signaler ensuite les essais d'André Monglond.<sup>13</sup> Le no. 2 ne nous paraît pas très important. Le no. 1 (p. 15-89) est dédié à l'Abbé Bremond, l'auteur de *L'histoire du Sentiment Religieux en France*, par un auteur qui veut écrire un jour "L'histoire sentimentale des Générations Romantiques." Les quatre chapitres de ce volume semblent être en quelque sorte des exercices de style. On ne voit pas trop l'idée de l'auteur; ce sont des études assez amorphes; pas exactement de l'érudition; cependant il reste un usage intelligent des matériaux déjà existants. On y trouve d'ailleurs, d'une part, la tradition catholique orthodoxe qui professe pour le caractère de

<sup>10</sup> *Thérèse ou la Promenade sur le Lac, Semaine Littéraire*, Genève, 11 et 18 avril, 1925.

<sup>11</sup> *L'Affaire Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 1906.

<sup>12</sup> "The Part played by Horace Walpole and James Boswell in the Quarrel between Rousseau and Hume," *P. Q.*, iv, 351-63.

<sup>13</sup> "Les deux dernières années de Rousseau et les *Rêveries d'un Promeneur solitaire*," "La Vie intérieure d'un Conventionnel, disciple de Jean-Jacques," "La jeunesse de Senancour," "Clés d'Adolphe," *Vies Pré-romantiques*, dans la *Collection des études romantiques* d'André Girard, Paris, Presses fr. et Belles Lettres, 1925, no. 15.

Rousseau le mépris de l'homme qui n'a pas exposé sa progéniture aux "Enfants trouvés" [Ah! si les ennemis de Rousseau étaient reconnaissants, ils devraient bien élever un monument aux enfants de Rousseau: Que feraient ces Archiloques, s'ils n'avaient pas ces enfants à brandir contre leur bête noire!], et d'autre part une certaine indulgence—dans la seconde partie surtout; Monglond est probablement un disciple de Bremond qui aime les sentimentaux. Dans cet essai, il y a tout le séjour à Paris et passablement se rapportant à Rousseau après la mort. On devine pourquoi il ne cite qu'une fois, dans une note qu'on sent ajoutée après-coup, Foster, *Le Dernier Séjour de J.-J. Rousseau à Paris* (1921) qui couvre la même période: c'est que son essai était écrit depuis bien des années; il n'a pas voulu le remanier et n'a cité Foster que par acte de conscience.<sup>14</sup>

M. Gillet<sup>15</sup> parle des "reliques" de Jean-Jacques, léguées à l'Institut en 1925 par le Marquis Fernand de Girardin. Disons-nous quelque chose de *La Psychologie de J.-J. Rousseau*, par M. L. Proal (Alcan 1923, 455 pp.)? Il est bon qu'un psychologue de temps en temps reprenne le cas Rousseau à mesure que des données nouvelles sont acquises (comme Chatelain, Moebius, Cabanès, Raspail etc.). M. Proal discute beaucoup de choses intéressantes; mais, quant au problème psychologique, franchement il ne nous révèle pas grand chose. Le passage suivant en fait foi (p. 256 et 254):

A la précision trompeuse de ces diagnostics [du passé], hystérie, psychasténie, neurasthénie, il faut donc (avec le docteur Magnan, le Dr. Serem, le Dr. Briand . . .) préférer celui de dégénéré supérieur, dont la déséquilibration constitutionnelle est caractérisée avant tout par un développement anormal de la sensibilité.<sup>16</sup> . . . Un type de déséquilibré de la sensibilité avec tendances paranoïaques, caractérisées par l'orgueil et la défiance . . . un tempérament morbide dont l'exagération réalise le délire de la persécution à base d'interprétation. . ." (p. 254).

---

<sup>14</sup> Nous le devinons parce que voici longtemps que M. Lombard n'est plus à la Bibliothèque de Neuchâtel, et c'est lui que M. Monglond remercie de lui avoir donné ses renseignements (p. 87-89).

<sup>15</sup> *La Collection Girardin à Chaalis, le reliquaire de Jean-Jacques*, de R. d. D. M., 1 sept. 1925, p. 134-161.

<sup>16</sup> M. P. cependant explique qu'en style technique "dégénéré" ne signifie pas "dégénéré." Alors?

. 'Peut-on s'empêcher de penser à Molière: "... et voilà ce qui fait que votre fille est muette!" D'ailleurs Rousseau est placé dans une même catégorie avec Lucrèce, Socrate, Pascal, Luther, le Tasse, B. de St. Pierre, Strindberg, les prophètes d'Israël, Mahomet et d'autres fondateurs de religion... on pourrait être classé de façon plus humiliante. Selon Proal lui-même, sa grande trouvaille est un portrait psychologique de Rousseau par Rousseau dans *Le Persifleur* (p. 263-4).

Saluons maintenant une publication attendue depuis longtemps, c'est vrai, que cependant on est surpris de voir paraître déjà, car elle est formidable. C'est l'édition de *La Nouvelle Héloïse* dans la collection "Les Grands Ecrivains de la France."<sup>17</sup> Comment Mornet est arrivé à achever ce travail au milieu de ses innombrables activités, c'est son secret. Mais il serait difficile d'imaginer une publication plus érudite, plus fouillée jusque dans les moindres recoins. Et encore a-t-on le sentiment que l'auteur n'a pas épuisé le contenu de ses fiches.<sup>18</sup> Ajoutez à cela que le premier volume, qui est tout entier consacré à *l'Introduction*, contient aussi une histoire du roman au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, avec bibliographie des romans de 1741-80 (pp. 335-385)—un ouvrage en lui-même, histoire plus complète qu'on n'en a jamais vue. Nous pouvions nous y attendre, après la sévère appréciation que Mornet avait donnée du volume de S. Etienne.<sup>19</sup> La conclusion générale de Mornet en ce qui con-

<sup>17</sup> Hachette, 1925, 4 vol., pp. 396, 422, 290, 418.

<sup>18</sup> C'est ce qui explique peut-être qu'il ne cite pas toujours ses collègues; p. ex., I, 202-3, l'article G. R. Havens, sur Bomston, *M. L. N.*, March, 1920. Il en est un surtout dont l'absence nous a surpris: nous n'avons trouvé nulle part mentionné—pas même à la p. 110-11 de Vol. I—l'excellent petit livre de Culcasi: *Gli influssi italiani nell' opere di G. G. Rousseau* (1907). *Les Jardins de l'Intelligence*, de L. Corpechot, 1912, sans doute se rapportent au 17<sup>me</sup> siècle, mais comme les jardins anglais vantés par Rousseau descendent de ceux du 17<sup>me</sup> siècle, cette étude eût mérité une mention, soit I, 71-77, "Art des Jardins," soit III, 222 ss.

<sup>19</sup> *Le Genre Romanesque en France depuis l'Apparition de La Nouvelle Héloïse à la Révolution*, Paris, Colin, 1922 (cf. *R. H. L.*, xxx (1923), 90-92). La thèse d'Etienne est que Rousseau n'est pas responsable du sentimentalisme que les histoires de la littérature lui prêtent généralement. La thèse nous paraît fort juste; Mornet reproche surtout à l'auteur d'avoir fondé ses assertions sur un nombre trop limité de romans.

cerne le roman de Rousseau est en somme négative. La voici (p. 302) :

*La Nouvelle Héloïse* a donc créé et détruit dans le roman. Mais elle n'a rien détruit de la philosophie des philosophes ni de l'esprit des gens d'esprit. Et si elle a créé de la passion, elle a créé en même temps, et avec l'aide des Anglais, la passion de la vertu. Il se peut que le romantisme soit tout Rousseau. C'est une vérité où tout n'est pas vrai, et qui n'est pas de notre sujet. Il est seulement assuré que la *Nouvelle Héloïse*, à elle seule, n'aurait pas, avant 1789, créé de romantisme. Elle n'aurait même pas, exactement, créé des romantiques.

Un mérite qui selon Mornet paraît peut-être rester à Rousseau, c'est d'avoir déprécié le roman d'intrigue au profit du roman de discussion philosophique (p. 60). Aussi bien, une telle appréciation semble devoir être le résultat de toute recherche d'érudition poussée à ce point : plus on étudie autour d'un auteur, plus son originalité doit paraître s'évaporer. C'est presque dommage, parce que cela étouffe un peu l'intérêt : on aime l'idée de l'originalité. Dans le domaine des idées spécifiquement philosophiques de Rousseau, exposées au cours de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*, il n'en est pas autrement ; Mornet montre, avec documentation à l'appui, que Rousseau a été novateur en peu de choses : "*La Nouvelle Héloïse* peut donc bouleverser les cœurs ; elle ne doit pas tout à fait les surprendre" (p. 58. Cf. 60, 62 ss., 68, 70, 74, 108, 267 etc.). Mais Rousseau a repensé par lui-même tous ces problèmes, et, là, la force de son action : "Au total, il semble bien que Rousseau ait suivi le conseil que St.-Preux donnait à Julie : il vaut toujours mieux de trouver de soi-même les choses qu'on trouverait dans les livres" (p. 111).

Le texte reproduit est celui de la première édition de Rey (p. 157 et circa). Le travail de bénédictin de Mornet pour l'établissement de ce texte nous écrase tout simplement. Et n'est-il pas cruel de penser qu'au moment où ce texte s'imprimait, M. P.-P. Plan découvrait la copie de *La Nouvelle Héloïse* faite pour Mme d'Houdetot (*Corr. Gén.* III, 293) ? Non pas que cette copie eût apporté probablement aucune révélation de grande importance, mais quand on a fait si minutieusement un si énorme travail, il est vexant de penser que cet instrument de travail existait, et qu'on n'ait pas pu s'en servir.

Un point où nous ne pouvons pas être tout-à-fait d'accord avec



Mornet c'est celui de l'époque où aurait été terminée *La Nouvelle Héloïse*; Mornet (p. 82 ss.) croit que la "rédaction définitive" était terminée dès l'automne de 1757. Mais nous ne pouvons aborder ce problème ici, nous renvoyons à un prochain numéro de *P. M. L. A.*

Après la question des manuscrits (p. 158), vient la "Bibliographie des éditions du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle." Que celui qui veut s'amuser, s'amuse dans ce dédale effrayant (pp. 157-234); et que, s'il n'est pas satisfait encore, il reprenne Dufour, *Recherches Bibliographiques* (pp. 81-112) sur le même sujet: nous prétendons que le calcul intégral doit être un jeu d'enfant à côté de pareils casse-têtes. Mornet s'arrête au 18<sup>me</sup> siècle; Dufour s'aventure au 19<sup>me</sup>, et puis dans cet autre labyrinthe des traductions de *La Nouvelle Héloïse*.

P. 238 ss., Mornet détaille le succès fabuleux de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*—la mauvaise humeur des gens de lettres (Voltaire surtout, dont la mesquinerie fait peine), et l'enthousiasme du public quand même: "Tout Paris pour Rodrigue a les yeux de Chimène. . . ." P. 264 ss., c'est "l'influence" de *La Nouvelle Héloïse*. Et que de points encore . . . : Chronologie de *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, *Nouvelle Héloïse* et le pays de Clarens, Les figures de femmes qui ont fourni des éléments pour Julie, et les philosophes (Holbach ou Helvétius), pour Wolmar, etc., etc.

En cherchant bien, nous trouvons un point que nous voudrions voir éclaircir: celui des noms. Certains, comme le dit Mornet, sont pris de la réalité, Claude Anet, Merveilleux, l'Amiral Anson etc. Il nous apprend aussi que Etanges était auparavant Orsinge, et autres détails. Le nom de Julie, nous le savons, était à la mode (voir le théâtre de Destouches p. ex.). Mais Saint-Preux, mais Bomston . . . où Rousseau a-t-il cherché ceux-là?

Passons au volume suivant. Dans les *Notes*, autant que dans l'*Introduction*, la brillante érudition de Mornet triomphe. Le roman porte le titre de *Moderne Héloïse* ou *Nouvelle Héloïse*, car Abélard et Héloïse sont en faveur,—et Mornet cite quantité de titres à l'appui; il y en a bien, dit-il, soixante (II, vii-viii). Sur l'habitude des romanciers de donner leurs ouvrages pour des mémoires, il renvoie au I, 40. Donnons un seul exemple des Notes si méticuleuses de Mornet (à la p. 7-8):

Un héros du romancier Thibouville, le marquis de Barbazan, parle comme Saint-Preux: "le poison qui me dévore m'est encore cher" (*l'Ecole de l'amitié*, Amsterdam, Arkstee et Merkus, 1757, t. II, p. 340). Il est probable d'ailleurs que Rousseau ignorait Thibouville. Ces rencontres d'expression que nous signalerons parfois prouvent simplement qu'il y avait avant Jean-Jacques des cœurs sensibles et qu'on était préparé à le comprendre.

Parmi les lettres annotées avec particulièrement de soin, indiquons: Lettre du Valais (I, 23); Lettre 57, sur le Duel,—plus de vingt citations de contemporains relatives à cette discussion; II<sup>me</sup> partie, Lettre 33, 52 (question du vin); III<sup>me</sup> p., Lettres 21 et 22, question du Suicide (reprise de *l'Introduction*, vol. I, 103 ss.); IV<sup>me</sup> p., Lettre 3, Voyage de L'Amiral Anson; 11, l'Elysée; 17, La Promenade sur le Lac (adressée d'abord à Claire—naturellement car quand elle fut écrite le personnage de Bomston n'était pas encore créé;<sup>20</sup> et les dernières lettres.

Ici il convient de mentionner l'article de M. Hippolyte Buffenoir,<sup>21</sup> qui détaille l'histoire de cette copie de *La Nouvelle Héloïse* que Rousseau fit pour Mme d'Houdetot. Pour elle seule d'abord il avait voulu ajouter les dernières parties du roman; et puis tout changea; l'orage de la brouille avec Mme d'Epinaï entraîna l'abandon des relations avec Mme d'Houdetot; mais Rousseau avait promis, et Mme d'Houdetot ne lui laissa pas oublier la copie—qui fut faite. On la croyait perdue; nous avons dit tout à l'heure que M. P.-P. Plan l'avait localisée (*Corr. Gén.*, III, 293).

Les attaques impitoyables contre Rousseau continuent, quoique—nous l'avons dit—elles soient graduellement submergées par des études faites dans une attitude objective et scientifique. Rappelons-nous ici C.-A. Fusil,<sup>22</sup> c'est le livre le plus divertissant qui se puisse concevoir. Faut-il que certains esprits aient peur du spectre de Rousseau pour se laisser aller à écrire des ouvrages pareils? Une chose qui étonne dans cette affaire c'est que Plon

<sup>20</sup> A propos de la Lettre 44, nous aurions voulu quelques mots pour expliquer l'introduction du personnage de Lord Bomston qui ne figurait pas dans les premières conceptions du roman.

<sup>21</sup> *Historique d'un Manuscrit de La Nouvelle Héloïse*, dans "Révolution française," No. 27, 1925 (tirage à part Lib. Charaway, 1926, 23 pp.).

<sup>22</sup> *Rousseau, Juge de Jean-Jacques, ou la Comédie de l'Orgueil et du Cœur*, Plon, 1923, VII, 334 pp.

ait imprimé, avec la marque de la maison, un livre si extrêmement naïf. Et à peine moins partial, est l'article de Francis Waterhouse.<sup>23</sup> Selon nous, on trouvera là l'interprétation la plus burlesquement défigurée de faits et de paroles parfaitement simples sous prétention de critique littéraire. Seillières se soulagea d'un nouvel accès de colère dans un livre bilieux où cet esprit de philosophe établit un diagnostic psychopathique effrayant, ayant découvert dans les *Confessions* et dans les *Dialogues* une abondance de ces symptômes sinistres qu'on peut trouver en tout homme et qui sont si commodes quand on veut perdre quelqu'un dans l'opinion des foules naïves. Il fait penser au mot de Joseph de Maistre: "Je ne sais ce qu'il y a dans la conscience d'un bandit; mais je sais ce qu'il y a dans celle d'un honnête homme,—et c'est affreux."

Nous voudrions pouvoir dire que dans son dernier livre<sup>24</sup> M. Babbitt a un peu tempéré sa Rousseau-phobie. Il n'y a pas grand changement cependant; son livre contient maints passages, particulièrement dans une *Introduction* de 26 pp., qui trahissent le même esprit de fanatisme que nous connaissons de longue date. La grande distinction de Rousseau est d'avoir donné "wrong answers to real problems." "The nature to which he wishes us to return is only a conceit . . . [it is] glorification of instinct." Et, si Rousseau doit être appelé sincère: "well, such sincere people are found in insane asylums" (p. 84).

Revenons en France. Parmi les esprits chagrins dont la voix a été distinguée dans ces dernières années, il faut nommer d'abord, Carrère, *Les Mauvais Maîtres* (Plon, 1922)—Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Balzac, Stendhal etc.—l'article Rousseau consiste en une opposition dramatique, éloquente et facile, entre Dante "puissance lumineuse," et Rousseau "force ténébreuse," "le plus pernicieux, le plus influent, le plus malfaisant des mauvais maîtres" est ce "Jocrisse de Rousseau." Puisque M. Carrère l'estime ainsi, cela doit être vrai . . . passons. Après Carrère, Jacques Maritain.<sup>25</sup> "J.-J. Rousseau ou le Saint de la Nature," titre ironique

<sup>23</sup> "An Interview with J.-J. Rousseau," *P. M. L. A.*, 1922, pp. 113-127.

<sup>24</sup> *Democracy and Leadership*, Houghton Mifflin, 1924, 344 pp.

<sup>25</sup> *Trois réformateurs, Luther, Descartes, Rousseau*, Coll. Le Rousseau d'or, Plon, 1925, 284 pp.

naturellement (pp. 133 ss.) accapare presque la moitié du volume. M. Maritain est le critique littéraire de *l'Ère Moderne*, auteur de beaucoup d'articles de revue, et de huit volumes (p. ex. *Philosophie Bergsonienne*; et un autre a comme titre *Anti-moderne*). Il est éditeur de *La Revue des Jeunes*. C'est un des grands adeptes de la renaissance Thomiste . . . alors naturellement pour lui, Rousseau est un "pervertisseur prodigieux" (p. 169), "un laquais de génie" (p. 209), à qui nous devons "ce cadavre d'idées chrétiennes dont l'immense putréfaction empoisonne aujourd'hui l'univers" (p. 211). Que voulez-vous? On ne peut plus se contenter de cette éloquence à coup de grands mots qui signifient tant de choses, c. à d. peu de choses en général. Et, avec la meilleure volonté du monde, nous ne pouvons voir dans ce livre qu'un bon exemple de verbiage (qu'on voie surtout son appréciation du *Contrat Social*, p. 189 ss.); nous répétons avec Montesquieu: "Les gens raisonnables aiment les raisons." On remarquera cependant une note nouvelle; Maritain s'incline devant la sincérité de Rousseau; il signale en lui "le mimétisme de la sainteté," et une "duplicité sincère." Alors, un pas encore, et—s'il n'était pas trop commis à son Thomisme violent—Maritain rejoindrait le groupe des écrivains catholiques qui aujourd'hui s'attachent à réclamer Rousseau en qui ils veulent voir en vérité un grand esprit religieux, sinon catholique: tels Masson,<sup>26</sup> Bremond<sup>27</sup> et Giraud.<sup>28</sup> Ce groupe s'oppose aujourd'hui à celui des "muckrakers" d'hier, Lasserre, Bourget, Seillières, Carrère, etc.

Dans le domaine des recherches relatives à certaines phases spéciales de la pensée de Rousseau, il faut rappeler Francisque Vial,<sup>29</sup> Inspecteur général de l'Instruction Publique. Son petit livre est un chef-d'œuvre de clarté, de présentation intelligente cherchant à souligner l'unité de pensée chez Rousseau, non seulement dans le domaine de l'éducation mais dans les rapports de celle-ci avec le reste de sa philosophie. On n'est pas habitué encore, en France moins qu'ailleurs, à tant d'impartialité. Nous attirons surtout l'attention sur le rapprochement—déjà indiqué par

<sup>26</sup> *La Religion de J.-J. Rousseau*, 1914.

<sup>27</sup> *Pour le Romantisme*, 1923.

<sup>28</sup> *Le Christianisme de Chateaubriand*, I, ch. III, "J.-J. Rousseau et son école," Hachette, 1925, 196 pp.

<sup>29</sup> *La Doctrine de l'éducation de Rousseau*, Delagrave, 1920, 205 pp.

Taine—entre la notion de “l’homme naturel” de Rousseau, et le “type” abstrait des Classiques. Il y a là une parenté évidente et que les Rousseauphobes se sont efforcés de ne pas voir ; si le rapport existe, toutes leurs attaques contre le Rousseau ‘destructeur de l’idéal classique,’ perdrait en effet tout sens. Pesez cette parole que Vial met en vedette (*Emile*, II) : “On a essayé tous les instruments hors un, le seul précisément qui puisse réussir, la liberté *bien réglée*.” Qui viendra ensuite nous parler d’anarchie morale ; car c’est bien là la thèse centrale de Rousseau dans *l’Emile*.

Nous n’insistons pas sur l’article de George R. Havens,<sup>30</sup>—tous les Américains l’ont lu. C’est un travail très objectif ; mais on aurait voulu que l’auteur tirât quelques conclusions : considère-t-il que les résultats de son enquête aient quelque portée dans la grande mêlée Rousseauiste ; justifie-t-elle les anathèmes nouveaux des Carrère et des Maritain, ou fait-elle pencher la balance du côté des Vial, Masson, Giraud ?

L’idée dominante de l’article d’A. O. Lovejoy,<sup>31</sup> est indiquée dans le titre. Faisant ressortir l’importance de la *Note 1* du *Discours*—sur la perfectibilité morale de l’espèce humaine,—l’auteur prétend que ces pages seules suffisent à indiquer une disposition “essentially antagonistic to primitivism, as well as antagonistic to religious orthodoxy” (p. 175).

Tout à fait original est le travail de Richard Ashley Rice.<sup>32</sup> Avec une documentation qu’on est surpris de trouver possible en Amérique (M. Rice a travaillé dans les bibliothèques de Harvard et de l’Univ. d’Indiana) l’auteur cherche à établir l’accomplissement réel de Rousseau dans cette question de “la nature.” Déjà les travaux de Mornet avaient montré combien Rousseau est peu

<sup>30</sup> “La Théorie de la Bonté naturelle de l’homme chez Rousseau,” *R. H. L.*, xxx et xxxii (1924-25).

<sup>31</sup> “The Supposed Primitivism of Rousseau’s Discourse on Inequality,” *M. P.*, xxi (1923), 165-86.

<sup>32</sup> *Rousseau and the Poetry of Nature in Eighteenth Century France*, Smith Coll. Studies in Mod. Lang. vii, nos. 3 and 4, 1925, 96 pp. Il est vrai que la théorie qu’il propose avait été entrevue par F. Maury (vi, 311 du grand Petit de Julleville) dans cette phrase : “Si Rousseau a pour ainsi dire retrouvé le sentiment de la nature, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre a été le législateur de l’art descriptif ; il a fait la théorie de ce qui n’était qu’intuition de génie et d’âme chez son maître.” Il y a loin de là pourtant, à détailler et creuser l’idée comme l’a fait Rice.

nouveau s'il s'agit simplement de parler de la nature; et M. Riee reprend cela: mais cette nature *de la littérature* ne correspondait à rien *dans la vie*; la littérature des bergeries et des pastorales était toute conventionnelle,—elle va de Pétrarque et d'Honoré d'Urfé jusqu'à Rousseau. Rousseau découvre qu'il y a une *vraie nature*, et il *essaye* de l'exprimer; mais il l'exprime en se servant des termes de la nature postiche, conventionnelle, littéraire. Il a donc eu le sentiment de la nature, mais il n'a pas eu l'art de l'exprimer. En ceci la postérité s'est trompée; Rousseau n'a pas achevé l'œuvre, il n'a fait que la pressentir: ce sont Bernardin de St.-Pierre et Chateaubriand qui ont su trouver *l'art* qu'il fallait.

Terminons en mentionnant quelques études *autour de Rousseau*. Gilbert Chinard ajoute un chapitre à la vie de l'amie de Rousseau Mme d'Houdetot en faisant revivre l'épisode des rapports personnels de celle-ci avec Benjamin Franklin.<sup>33</sup> Et l'infatigable Rousseauiste, M. Buffenoir, publie un livre qui aurait dû être écrit depuis longtemps.<sup>34</sup> Ce volume est écrit avec l'esprit d'érudition, d'intelligente sympathie qui distingue tout ce que fait M. Buffenoir, et il constitue une addition excellente aux volumes, qui depuis longtemps font autorité; sur *La Comtesse d'Houdetot, une amie de J.-J. Rousseau*, et *La Comtesse d'Houdetot, sa famille, ses amis*. On attend avec impatience *la Comtesse de Boufflers, l'idole du Temple, la Minerve savante, 1725-1800*.<sup>35</sup>

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Smith College.*

<sup>33</sup> *Les amitiés américaines de Mme d'Houdetot d'après sa Corresp. inédite avec Benjamin Franklin et Thomas Jefferson*, Paris, Champion, 1924, viii + 62 vp.

<sup>34</sup> *La Maréchale de Luxembourg (1707-1787), souvenirs, documents, témoignages*, Paris, Emile-Paul, 1924, viii + 255 pp., Coll. *Études sur le XVIII<sup>e</sup> s.*

<sup>35</sup> Comme membre de la "Société J.-J. Rousseau," et Correspondant d'Amerique aux "Annales," osons-nous terminer par un conseil? Les bibliothèques américaines qui n'ont pas encore la collection des *Annales J.-J. Rousseau* feront bien de ne pas tarder à l'acquérir. On ne réimprimera pas ces volumes,—indispensables pour toute étude sur Rousseau,—et il ne reste qu'une soixantaine de collections complètes à la librairie Jullien à Genève. La cotisation de la "Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau," qui donne droit aux volumes annuels est de 15 francs suisses. S'adresser pour les adhésions et souscriptions à la Librairie Jullien, Place du Bourg-de-Four, 32, Genève, Suisse.

## BAUDELAIRE AND THE ARTS

Twice in his diaries Baudelaire speaks of his love of the pictorial: "les images, ma grande, mon unique, ma primitive passion." His father was an amateur artist, living in an artistic milieu, for the sculptor Ramey and Naigeon the painter, conservateur of the Luxembourg Museum, witnessed the boy's birth-certificate. Baudelaire's friends often heard him speak of his walks as a child to the Luxembourg Gardens, accompanied by his father, who explained to him the statues there. The inventory of housefurnishings made at his father's death mentions a score of pastels and wash-drawings; after the poet died, his mother gave Asselineau two of these, one an old oil-painting, a Saint Anthony tempted by a demon or a fallen angel, the other a companion-piece painted by Baudelaire père, a bacchante surrounded by cupids (Crépet, *Etude biographique*, 1919 ed., p. 13, note). The impress of this early environment was reinforced by his father's death, before the poet was quite six years old, and its effect upon him is seen in his autobiographical note: "Enfance: Vieux mobilier Louis XVI, antiques, consulat, pastels, société dix-huitième siècle."

So when, in 1842, Baudelaire became of age, he went to live among the artists who frequented the Hôtel Pimodan, collected old masters, and was for three years equally interested in painting and in poetry. According to Prarond, he rarely passed the Louvre without entering the galleries to study two or three pictures there; and, significantly, he preferred the sombre paintings of the Spanish masters. It was thus he prepared himself for his literary début, the *Salons* of 1845 and 1846, pamphlets which show the definite trend of his genius. For all in all, fully half of his critical articles concern the fine arts. He left no paintings of his own, as did Théophile Gautier, but his skill with the pencil may be seen in the sketches reproduced in the *Vie anecdotique* by MM. Séché and Bertaut. "En France, on me trouve trop peintre," says the poet in his projected book on Belgium and its art.

Is he "trop peintre" in his poetry? Not by an excess of color adjective, except red; all his colors are fewer than his blacks and whites, if with them we place his notations of shade and shadow, and, more numerous than all the touches of gloom, the flashes of

light or fire to which his soul aspired. No, his is rather the 'art of the etcher, who enlivens his plates by contrasted high lights and bits of sanguine; and it is significant that all his life he collected prints and engravings.

Is he "trop peintre" in his inspiration? Having almost memorized his poems while translating them into English verse, I began to examine the *Salons*, to see if the paintings there described bore any relation to *Les Fleurs du Mal*. For he had written in 1846 (*Cur. esth.*, 82): "le meilleur compte-rendu d'un tableau pourra être un sonnet ou une élogie." Some of the results found are at least interesting. *Le Salon de 1845* praises (p. 31) a painting by Dugasseau, *Sapho faisant le saut de Leucade*, which of course suggests the poem *Lesbos*. One thinks of *Cain et Abel* in reading Baudelaire's comment (p. 73) on Carraud's *La première famille humaine*: "Le petit Caïn est le mieux réussi." There is a long description of *Le Dante et Virgile aux enfers* (p. 95), suggestive in its setting of the poem, *Don Juan aux enfers*, and the catalogue of Delacroix's work shows that he depicted this hero of the Romanticists in another painting, *La barque de Don Juan*. Baudelaire's extravagant admiration for Delacroix justifies the rapprochement. Among the landscape painters, the poet prefers the austere and melancholy Théodore Rousseau, and one thinks of *Ciel brouillé* and *Brumes et pluies* in reading his comment on another artist: "M. Hérault . . . sait fort bien exprimer les ciels clairs et souriants et les brumes flottantes, traversées par un rayon de soleil. Il connaît toute cette poésie particulière aux pays du Nord."

There are two mentions of Watteau's *Embarquement pour Cythère*, which Baudelaire so cynically travestied in his *Voyage à Cythère*; the poet would include a reproduction of it in a proposed *musée de l'amour*, among the *estampes libertines* which leave in his mind an impression of melancholy and *mauvaise humeur* (pp. 119-120). And already in 1846 he has envisaged this subject under aspects more realistic, for he says (p. 207) that if Ingres were to paint the *Embarquement*, his picture would not be "*solâtre et riant*" like Watteau's. Other paintings that he would include in his collection are Ingres's *Grande Odalisque* and *Petite Odalisque*. If my memory is correct, one of these corresponds to the setting of *Les Bijoux*, as does also Goya's *La Maya desnuda*. There is a scene in the short story, *La Fanfarlo*, of 1847, which recalls



*Les Bijoux*, even to the rouge which gives the final touch, but the cold detachment of these verses points to a painting as the probable directing force in his composition. Incidentally, *La Fanfarlo* contains a sort of prose version of the poem *Le Coucher du soleil romantique*, very possibly of pictorial origin: "Nous ressemblons tous plus ou moins à un voyageur qui aurait parcouru un très-grand pays, et regarderait chaque soir le soleil, qui jadis dorait superbement les agréments de la route, se coucher dans un horizon plat. Il s'assied avec résignation sur de sales collines couvertes de débris inconnus. . . ." Pictures of travellers in the desert were just coming into vogue with the rise of the school of Oriental landscape.

In *Les Phares*, composed as it would seem in 1846, Baudelaire describes a whole Salon Carré of old masters, all but two of whom are mentioned in the *Salons*. (Cf. pp. 8, 87, 109, 116, 117, 174). For Delacroix the *Salons* show even corresponding phrases. His color is "toujours sanglante et terrible"; his is a "sanglante et farouche désolation, à peine compensée par le vert sombre de l'espérance"; he intones a "hymne terrible à la douleur." Again, his color is "plaintive et profonde comme une mélodie de Weber." The quatrain wherein this impression finds a synthesis or a "correspondence" reads:

Delacroix,—lac de sang hanté des mauvais anges,  
Ombragé par un bois de sapins toujours vert,  
Où, sous le ciel chagrin, des fanfares étranges  
Passent, comme un soupir étouffé de Weber. . . .

It would be interesting to seek the paintings from which this composite landscape is drawn—a task much easier for the quatrains synthesizing Michael-Angelo and Rembrandt. At least ten other poems are by their titles or matter confessedly inspired by the fine arts; *Danse macabre* and *Le mauvais moine* are due to the Romantic vogue of the Dance of Death; one can see an engraving in *Allégorie* as well as in *Une gravure fantastique*, inspired by Mortimer; the sonnet to *La Beauté* recalls a statue. Others, like *Les Bijoux* and the shorter *Femmes damnées*, begin with static descriptions such as might well be suggested by paintings or statues.

Baudelaire's is certainly the vision of an artist. But it is a special sort of vision, complicated by his *nervosité* and his lust to imprison even sensation in a metaphysical unity. Like the hero of *La Fanfarlo* (p. 430), so plainly a portrait of himself, the poet

longs to penetrate the symbolism of colors and feelings (*Oeuv. Post.*, 412), whose equivalence he finds perfectly expressed in Delacroix's color-schemes, characterized by the adjectives "farouche" and "plaintive." So in the *Salons* he sets forth a whole theory of color, its harmonies and its counterpoint of reds and greens, leading up to this paragraph (p. 93): "J'ignore si quelque analogiste a établi solidement une gamme complète des couleurs et des sentiments, mais je me rappelle un passage d'Hoffmann qui exprime parfaitement mon idée"; and he goes on to quote from the *Kreisleriana*: "Ce n'est pas seulement en rêve, et dans le léger délire qui précède le sommeil, c'est encore éveillé, lorsque j'entends de la musique, que je trouve une analogie et une réunion intime entre les couleurs, les sons et les parfums. Il me semble que toutes ces choses ont été engendrées par un même rayon de lumière, et qu'elles doivent se réunir dans un merveilleux concert. L'odeur des soucis bruns et rouges produit surtout un effet magique sur ma personne. Elle me fait tomber dans une profonde rêverie, et j'entends alors comme dans le lointain les sons graves et profonds du hautbois." Need one recall Baudelaire's sonnet *Correspondances*?

La Nature est un temple où de vivants piliers  
Laissent parfois sortir de confuses paroles;  
L'homme y passe à travers des forêts de symboles  
Qui l'observent avec des regards familiers.

Comme de longs échos qui de loin se confondent,  
Dans une ténébreuse et profonde unité,  
Vaste comme la nuit et comme la clarté,  
Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent.

Il est des parfums frais comme des chairs d'enfants,  
Doux comme le hautbois. . . .

The title of the poem would seem to have been suggested by Swedenborg, who uses the word to denote the symbolism of truths celestial and spiritual in the things of nature. In *Séraphita*, Balzac refers to the great mystic's visions, "ses mondes où les couleurs font entendre de délicieux concerts," and "ses jardins où les fleurs parlent." Flowers, fruits, and trees—the *vivants piliers*—are to Swedenborg symbols of wisdom (*Heaven and Hell*, § 176). Baudelaire, who several times mentions the mystic, might easily have read him in translation. *Heaven and Hell* even has a para-

graph on the qualities of the vowels, whose color will be variously described in the sonnets of Baudelaire's disciples, Rimbaud and Ghil. In the third heaven, the angels cannot utter the vowels *i* and *e*, but instead of them, *y* and *eu*; they use the vowels *a*, *o* and *u* because they give a full sound (*True Religion*, § 278). An examination of Baudelaire's variants in the *Fleurs du Mal* will show that he applied this principle most often in his corrections.

But we must return to *Les Correspondances*. In his *Paradis artificiels* of 1861, Baudelaire confesses that while under the influence of hasheesh, "le premier objet venu devient symbole parlant (p. 206). Fourier et Swedenborg, l'un avec ses *analogies*, l'autre avec ses *correspondances*, se sont incarnés dans le végétal et l'animal qui tombent sous votre regard, et, au lieu de vous enseigner par la voix, ils vous endoctrinent par la forme et la couleur." In his *first* study of the effects of hasheesh, published ten years before, there is no such metaphysical explanation. "Les équivoques les plus singulières, les transpositions d'idées les plus inexplicables ont lieu. Les sons ont une couleur, les couleurs ont une musique". . . (p. 375). Swedenborg gave meaning to his purchased dreams and their vagaries, as Hoffmann had justified his hyperaesthesia, which, as he tells us in his article on Wagner (*Art romant.*, p. 216), reacted to the overture of Lohengrin in a dazzling sensation of deepening space and light, magnified in an immense crescendo. Hence the sonnet *Correspondances*. Swedenborg, Hoffmann, Baudelaire: Mysticism, wine, hasheesh—various indeed are the origins of the Symbolistic school!

That Baudelaire, had he lived, would, like Chateaubriand, have denied his literary children, is apparent from one of his last letters, with its bitter comment, "il paraît que l'école Baudelaire existe." But he had started the confusion, and even in 1846 he saw its bearing. "Est-ce par une fatalité des décadences," he writes in *L'Art romantique* (p. 128), "qu'aujourd'hui chaque art manifeste l'envie d'empiéter sur l'art voisin, et que les peintres introduisent les gammes musicales dans la peinture, le sculpteur, de la couleur dans la sculpture, les littérateurs, des moyens plastiques dans la littérature?"

L. PIAGET SHANKS.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## A NOTE ON TIECK'S EARLY ROMANTICISM.

Haym, still the principal authority on Tieck, believes that the author, essentially a Rationalist, came to Romanticism primarily through Wackenroder, who saved him from pessimism and skepticism and instilled into him almost all the prerequisite qualities of the Romanticist. It is not surprising, then, to find the popular works of reference still following Haym on this point. We shall quote but two among many. Kummer<sup>1</sup> (p. 116) speaks of Tieck's "unausrottbares Erbteil an Verstandesnatur" and implies that although the author was (p. 118) "eine innige, phantasievolle Natur," Romanticism was merely an episode in his life. Koch<sup>2</sup> (p. 41) says: "es blieb in Tieck ungeachtet aller romantischen Strudelreien ein Bodensatz von lehrhaftem Rationalismus zurück," and he calls him "den aufgeklärten Berliner."

These thoroughly widespread views on Tieck, reinforced by the findings of Koldewey,<sup>3</sup> are not shared by some recent investigators, however. Thus, Marianne Thalmann<sup>4</sup> discovers a basic consistency in Tieck's mental makeup and literary output, finds that he is a consistent demonist, and points to the psychic factors underlying what we shall here call his *Denkform*. Stefansky<sup>5</sup> (p. 220), while making the admission "sein Lebensgefühl und dessen Ausdruck . . . verändert sich unmerkbar," speaks of Tieck's "eigengemässe Denkform," which he states can be traced unalterably through his entire life. And A. E. Lussky, in his recent Michigan dissertation,<sup>6</sup> although not using all the available evidence, concludes that Tieck was a born Romanticist.

These recent critics which we have just mentioned use Tieck's early works as their main source. It is the purpose of this note to cite evidence, chiefly from Tieck's early letters to Wackenroder

<sup>1</sup> *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Dresden, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> Vogt und Koch, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 4. Aufl., 3. Bd., Leipzig und Wien, 1920.

<sup>3</sup> *Wackenroder und sein Einfluss auf Tieck*, Leipzig, 1904.

<sup>4</sup> *Probleme der Dämonie in Ludwig Tiecks Schriften*, Muncker-Forschungen 53, Weimar, 1919.

<sup>5</sup> *Das Wesen der deutschen Romantik*, Stuttgart, 1923.

<sup>6</sup> *Tieck's Approach to Romanticism*, Leipzig-Borna, 1925. Cf. the present writer's review of this work in *Modern Language Notes*, Dec., 1925.

and from other sources hitherto neglected, in support of the thesis that Tieck's *Denkform* was from the beginning innately Romantic and that from the very outset—three years before he entered the employ of Nicolai—Tieck opposed the spirit of Rationalism and Enlightenment.

It is the traditional practise to cite the influence of Tieck's "Rationalist" father upon his son. Certain statements and anecdotes in Köpke, as for example that referring to Paul Gerhard's hymn,<sup>7</sup> are usually quoted for this purpose. But Köpke also has evidence, on the contrary, that Johann Tieck was not the extreme Rationalist that he has been pictured. He owned and admired the early works of Goethe and Lenz and said, in reply to hostile criticisms of *Werther*, *Gotz* and other specimens of the "neue Poesie":<sup>8</sup> "Was reden denn die Leute, sie verstehen ja diese Bücher gar nicht! . . . Die Andern mögen sich anstellen, wie sie wollen, so etwas können sie doch nicht machen!" Furthermore, he regarded the Bible "als Grundbuch des Hauses und Lebens"<sup>9</sup> and in the evening used to read aloud to his family from such works as Goethe's *Götz*.<sup>10</sup>

We turn now to Tieck's early correspondence.

On June 12, 1792, Tieck, describing a ball which he had recently attended at the house of the Reichardts, writes to Wackenroder from Halle:<sup>11</sup>

Der Ball endigte sich um 11 Uhr, ich hatte ziemlich viel, aber ohne alle Teilnahme getanzt, fast alle Gesichter waren mir zuwider, ich bemerkte allenthalben Affektation und elende Eitelkeit, wo es vielleicht auch nicht der Fall war. Ich ging mit Bothe, Schmohl und Sack nach der Stadt, unter dem unerträglichsten Geschwätz, das mir in meiner wehmütigen Stimmung höchst zuwider war, ich sprach kein Wort, mögen sie es meinethalben immer für Zieerei gehalten haben! Es war am 3. Juni (der Geburtstag der Reichardtın), vielleicht bist du ausgegangen gewesen und

<sup>7</sup> Rudolf Köpke, *Ludwig Tieck*, 1. Teil, Leipzig, 1855, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>11</sup> *Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder. Briefwechsel mit Ludwig Tieck* (vol. 2 of *Wackenroders Werke und Briefe*, ed. by F. von der Leyen), Jena, 1910, pp. 56-58. Thalmann, *op. cit.*, p. 4, merely refers to this passage and others as evidence of Tieck's overwrought emotionalism. Walzel, *Deutsche Romantik*, Leipzig, 1908, also merely refers to it.

erinnerst Dich, dass es ein göttlicher Abend war, der Mond schien so hell, die Luft war so heiter und war der Himmel so blau. Ich begleitete mechanisch meine Gefährten bis zum Tor und kehrte dann um, ohne von ihnen eben bemerkt zu werden und ohne ein Wort zu sprechen. Ich forderte von der Natur Ersatz für die verlorenen Stunden und erhielt ihn, ich war wirklich einmal glücklich. Ich ging neben Garten hin, wo mich der balsamische Duft von tausend Blumen umfing, die Lichter erloschen nach und nach in den Häusern, die Hunde bellten mir allenthalben nach, ich ging vor einer Windmühle vorbei, deren schäumender Wasserfall wie Flammen in dem Strahl des Mondes flutete, alles war so schön, so abenteuerlich. Ich setzte mich oft nieder, die schönen Gegenden zu übersehen. Die Saale glänzte vor mir wie ein grosser See, tausend kleine Sterne zitterten auf der ungewissen Oberfläche, ein leichter, goldner Nebel ruhte über die ganze Gegend, die Wogen der Saale tönten in der einsamen Nacht wie die Schritte eines Wanderers, bald wie Harfentöne, bald wie das Rudern eines Schiffes. O wie oft dacht' ich an Dich, wie oft wünscht' ich Dich an meine Seite. Endlich stieg ich auf die Felsen, die schönste Gegend bei Giebichenstein, wie alles romantisch vor mir lag, mir war, als lebte ich in der fernsten Vergangenheit, die Ruinen des Ritterschlusses blickten so ernsthaft nach mir hin, die Felsen gegenüber, die Felsen über mir, die wankenden Bäume, das Hundebellen, alles war so schauerlich, alles stimmte die Phantasie so rein, so hoch. Oft sass ich halb im Traum, halb wachend, mit einem Auge süsse Träume sehend, mit dem andern in die schöne Gegend blickend.—Ruhend ist mir immer der Untergang des Mondes, er senkt sich so still, so bescheiden, einem Grössern Platz zu machen, voll so ruhiger Scham, und doch ist es, als könnte man ihm die tiefe Kränkung ansehen, dass er weichen muss, dass er nicht mehr nicht heller glänzen kann—ach verzeih! Du siehst, wie ich heut zum Schwarmen aufgelegt bin.—Das Heraufkommen des Tages ist mir immer so bang, so erwartungsvoll, die ganze Natur scheint aufmerksam. Jetzt stieg ich auf den höchsten Felsen. Das Morgenrot glänzte um den ganzen Horizont,—kurz diese Nacht gehört zu den schönsten Stunden meines Lebens, sie wird mir unvergesslich sein, ich habe hier manches gelernt, manches empfunden, was ich vorher nicht wusste, nicht empfand.

Köpke, of course, does not quote this passage, but speaks only in general terms of Tieck's nightly visits to Giebichenstein.<sup>12</sup> And yet it seems most essential for an understanding of Tieck's nature. For there is no denying the fact that it indicates his Romantic *Denkform* at an age (barely 19) when, according to traditional criticism, he was still a confirmed Rationalist. Of course there is sentimentalism and emotionalism in it, but far more than that. It marks in at least a dozen points a clear-cut delineation of the

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 139 ff.

born Romanticist. The fondness for the moon, the desire to get compensation from nature for pleasures otherwise denied, the picture of the water-mill, the lonely night, the stars, the simile of the waves and the wanderer's steps, the longing for the friendship of a true friend, the use of the word *romantisch* itself, the wish to be transported into a distant past, the picture of the nightly castle in ruins, the awe-inspiring atmosphere (das Schauerliche), the fluctuation between a dream-state and a state of consciousness, the preference for the moon rather than the sun, and the subconscious fear of daybreak—all these taken together are unquestionably elements that stamp the Tieck of 1792 not as a potential, or even an incipient Romanticist, but as a full-fledged Romanticist. Undoubtedly, too, the experiences of this night, which Tieck describes so vividly, were most instrumental in fortifying his truly Romantic *Denkform*—a thing, indeed, that his own words suggest.

Another letter of Tieck that deserves to be considered in this connection is one of 1793 addressed to his sister.<sup>13</sup> It describes his journey from Berlin to Erlangen. Tieck writes (p. 181):

Hinter Weissenfels wird die Gegend immer romantischer. . . . Die Saale ging immer mit uns, in der Ferne Ruinen, es war ein göttlicher Nachmittag.

Further on he says (p. 182):

Vor Naumburg kommt man an ein verfallnes Ritterschloss, es liegt göttlich unter lauter Felsen, die Gegend wird hier immer wilder, ich dachte unaufhörlich an Götz von Berlichingen und Goethe.

Here again the word *romantisch* itself is used with respect to a landscape; and again Tieck reveals his interest in ruins, an old knightly castle and a rocky, desert region. The reference to *Götz* in this connection is also significant.

A third passage from the same letter is as follows (p. 186):

Die Klöster müssen durchaus nicht ausgerottet werden, hier findet der Mensch der die Welt, oder den sie von sich stösst, doch eine sichere, heilige Zuflucht.

---

<sup>13</sup> It was published by Gotthold Klee in *Forschungen zur deutschen Philologie*. Festgabe für Rudolf Hildebrand. Leipzig, 1894, pp. 180-190.

It is paralleled by the sentiment once expressed by the youthful Tieck to his teacher Weisser:<sup>14</sup>

Es war doch eine schöne Einrichtung des Mittelalters, dass man dem verwirrenden Lärm der Welt entfliehen konnte! Man ging in ein Kloster und war von allen Sorgen der Welt befreit. Welche tiefe Ruhe muss es geben, einem grossen Gedanken das ganze Leben zu widmen, in ihn alle andern, die uns tausendfach quälen, versenken zu können! Ich wünschte, auch wir hätten unsere Klöster!

This is a typically Romantic thought and interest, which we find expressed again and again some ten years later when the movement reached its crest.

Finally we shall quote two passages, also from Tieck's letters to Wackenroder, to throw more light upon the author's early attitude toward Rationalism. He writes from Halle on June 12, 1792:<sup>15</sup>

Schon sind Empfindsamkeit und Liebe gebrandmarkt, diese Kinder des Himmels, welche er nur seinen Lieblingen schenkt, Kindesliebe und Ehrfurcht gegen das Alter gehören in unserm Zeitalter zu den plumpen Vorurteilen, Ehrfurcht für Religiosität ist nur für den Dummkopf—ob nicht nächstens ein neues Genie aufstehn wird, die Freundschaft eines Karlos und Posa lächerlich zu machen? Denn dies ist ja noch das Einzige, woran man sich nicht verstündigt hat. Noch diese Tugend umgestürzt und der Mensch steht da in seinem nackten elenden Egoismus,—er sich selbst genug, der Elende!—Ohne Tugend, ohne Enthusiasmus,—weniger als ein Tier! O Schande unserm Zeitalter!—Suche im Shakspear nach, in seinen ausgelassensten Charakteren, allenthalben vergisst er nie, dass Eltern und jeder Alte uns ehrwürdig sein müssen,—diese Ausgelassenheit war unsern aufgeklärten Zeitalter aufbehalten, denn uns regiert die Vernunft, wir bedürfen keiner andern Lenkung. O Fluch der Vernunft, die uns das nimmt, worauf der Mensch allein stolz sein kann, die uns lehrt, dass Dankbarkeit und Liebe gegen Eltern nur Vorurteile sind.

From Göttingen he writes on December 28, 1792:<sup>16</sup>

Die Menschen freilich, deren eifriges Bestreben dahingeht, alles was Mensch heisst, in sich zu ersticken, die nie aus sich selbst denken, oder empfinden, die sich in ihrer mechanischen Tätigkeit über alle diese Spasmacher unendlich erhaben glauben, ja die können freilich dies alles nicht

<sup>14</sup> Köpke, *op. cit.*, p. 105. For Tieck's similar attitude ten years later *cf. ibid.*, p. 287.

<sup>15</sup> von der Leyen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 64-65.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 143-144.



fassen, ihr Phlegma nehmen sie für Stoicismus und heroische Entsagung aller solcher Kindereien, weil sie weder Verstand noch Phantasie haben, so freuen sie sich unendlich des eingebildeten Triumphs, den ihr Verstand davon trägt,—nur *empfindende* Menschen können nach meinem Urteil gross und edel genannt werden.

The above considerations together with the passages, all of them written by Tieck while still in his teens, are submitted as additional evidence supplementing that adduced by Marianne Thalmann and by A. E. Lussky. They tend to corroborate the fact that even during his formative years the author was already endowed with a characteristically Romantic *Denkform*, which seems in germ to be in remarkable harmony with many of the later Romantic tenets, and which recoils in disgust from the doctrines of the prevalent Rationalism.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

*University of Cincinnati.*

---

## THE QUESTION OF PERSONAL CARICATURE IN *LE MONDE OÙ L'ON S'ENNUIE*

American critics, when speaking of Édouard Pailleron's masterpiece, sometimes remark knowingly that "its character-sketches or caricatures . . . have been regularly identified with certain personages of Pailleron's day."<sup>1</sup> Thus Professors Frank Otis Reed and John Brooks, in their new edition of this comedy, have gone a little further, and state in a more general way: "It was inevitable that types so clearly drawn should be recognized as portraits in Pailleron's time."<sup>2</sup> Such indefinite statements only whet curiosity without gratifying it. On the contrary, the following notes for readers of *Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie* are confined to definite information concerning Pailleron's reputed models.

Although Pailleron, in a preface to a later edition of this comedy, expressly disclaimed having drawn any portraits in it from life,<sup>3</sup> his contemporaries thought that Bellac greatly resembled Caro, professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne. This

<sup>1</sup> Hugh A. Smith, *Main Currents of Modern French Drama*, 1925, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Holt and Co., 1926, Introduction, p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> "La vérité est que je n'ai pas plus visé un individu qu'un salon; j'ai

supposition is well known today,<sup>4</sup> and the likeness was asserted by Professor Pendleton in the introduction to her pioneer school edition of the comedy.<sup>5</sup> Not long ago, however, M. Victor du Bled published a few fresh anecdotes concerning Caro and Pailleron.<sup>6</sup> Thus he reports that on the night of the first performance of this play, when Professor Caro met the scholar Gaston Boissier in the lobby of the Théâtre Français, both men exclaimed "Bellac, c'est toi!" Du Bled adds that the actor (Got) who played Bellac made himself up to look like Caro, imitating his voice and gestures. Hence public opinion was unanimous in seeing a resemblance between the puppet and the professor. Du Bled tells also about Pailleron's two ways of defending himself against the accusation that he had drawn Bellac from Caro. Sometimes he replied that he would have made Bellac much more ridiculous if he had been doing Caro's portrait, at other times he claimed that he had not foreseen the magnifying power of the stage nor guessed that Caro was so ripe for ridicule.

Turning now to consider the testimony concerning the probable relationships of Mme de Céran, Bellac's hostess in the play, more discrepancy will be found. Professor C. H. C. Wright drew attention recently to *le Monde où l'on s'ennuie* because of its satire of "the strenuous intellectualism of some of the salons of the early Third Republic," mentioning in this connection that of Mme de Blocqueville.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, my friend the veteran art critic and journalist, Raymond Koechlin, called my attention to the fact that the model for the character of Mme de Céran was said to have been Mme Aubernon de Nerville. Many interesting stories concerning the *salon* of this lady, where Alexandre Dumas fils was the guest of honor for years, will be found in two of du Bled's books, the 8th volume of his *Société française du XVII<sup>e</sup> au*

pris dans les salons et chez les individus les traits dont j'ai fait mes types, mais où voulait-on que je les prisse? Et ce sont si bien des types et si peu des portraits, qu'on a mis sur chacun d'eux jusqu'à cinq noms différents."

<sup>4</sup> See *Grand Dict. Larousse*, 2e suppl. (1890), art. "Caro."

<sup>5</sup> D. C. Heath & Co., 1894.

<sup>6</sup> *La Société française depuis cent ans*, II, *Mme Aubernon et ses amis*, 1924, pp. 197-8.

<sup>7</sup> Wright, *Background of Modern French Literature*, 1926, p. 302.

X<sup>e</sup> siècle, entitled *la Comédie de Société*, and his book, *Mme Aubernon et ses amis*.<sup>8</sup>

The tone of Mme Aubernon's drawing room was much freer and less academic than that of Mme de Céran, but it will be seen from du Bled's accounts that these women resemble each other in many ways. It will be remembered that Mme de Céran received in the country. Mme Aubernon also entertained at her villa, *Au cœur volant* at Louveciennes, as well as in Paris. Again, like Mme de Céran, she did not care to surround herself with pretty women: "Je donne à causer, non à aimer," she used to say. Moreover, she took a great interest in the drama. Not only were plays read before her guests, but elaborate amateur performances were given. For instance, at a slightly later date, Becque's *Parisienne* was performed for the first time in her drawing room, where Ibsen was also acted for the first time in France. I must note in passing that the late President Deschanel, who thus earned the surname of "le sous-préfet des salons" was one of her actors.<sup>9</sup> Mme Aubernon's iron will forced her bored guests to sit respectfully through these performances lasting from 10.30 p. m. to one o'clock.

The formalism which Mme Aubernon shared with Mme de Céran appeared in two pedantic practices. First, she always insisted upon general conversation at table, a rule which led to this amusing incident. When Labiche was a guest at one of her dinners, he tried to put in a word when Dumas or Renan was talking, and was suppressed by his hostess. Later, when given a chance to speak, Labiche had to confess that he was merely going to ask for another helping of peas. The second characteristic was a way of questioning all her guests one after the other on such topics as Shakespeare or adultery. I may add, parenthetically, that when this same Labiche was asked "Que pensez-vous de Shakespeare?" du Bled says he answered "Est-ce pour un mariage?" On another occasion, when Mme Aubernon asked one of her nieces for

<sup>8</sup> A portrait and brief account of her *salon* will also be found in Montfort's *25 Ans de littérature française*, II, pp. 167 ff.: "Les Salons" by M. Revon and P. Billotey.

<sup>9</sup> Montfort, *op. cit.*, p. 168. His biographer, Jean Mélia, states (1924) that Deschanel was made sub-prefect of Dreux in December, 1877, where he remained until May 23, 1879, becoming sub-prefect of Brest and then of Meaux before entering the Chamber in 1881.

her opinion on adultery, the latter replied with a simper, "Please excuse me, I had only prepared on incest!"

In addition to the facts furnished by du Bled, two more parallels between Mme Aubernon and Mme de Céran remain to be noticed. First, they were both republicans, for Revon and Billorey say that Mme Aubernon and her niece Mme de Nerville were nicknamed "les Précieuses radicales."<sup>10</sup> Secondly, Mme Dussane of the Comédie française has expressed the opinion that Pailleron may have found a suggestion for the dashing, outspoken Duchesse de Réville in the character of Mme Aubernon's mother, Mme de Nerville, a classic beauty with the bearing of the great ladies of the XVIIIth century.<sup>11</sup> The mother and daughter used to live together and received on the same days.

When I had reached this point in my inquiries, I noticed fortunately that Mme Dussane was to give a lecture for the Société des Grandes Conférences at Brussels, wittily entitled "le Monde où Pailleron s'ennuyait."<sup>12</sup> Thinking that it would be very interesting to discover what traditions were preserved by the Comédie française concerning the *clefs* of this play, I wrote to Mme Dussane, who very kindly sent me the facts that she possessed about Pailleron's comedy.<sup>13</sup> These were furnished her, she said, by Mme Bourget-Pailleron, the dramatist's daughter.<sup>14</sup>

In the latter's opinion, her father had several models for the *salon* of Mme de Céran. For instance, Mme Charles Buloz, his sister-in-law, had an important literary *salon*, that of the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, where Pailleron must have found subjects for his satire. In this connection, Mme Dussane remarks that Ganderax, the critic of the *Deux-Mondes*, received Pailleron's comedy somewhat coldly ("Cet art est le moyen et non le grand"<sup>15</sup>), and stated that its author was "suspect d'introduire le *reportage* au théâtre."<sup>16</sup> Although Ganderax professed to take no stock in the keys given by gossip for the play, he regretted

<sup>10</sup> Montfort, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

<sup>11</sup> Du Bled says that Mme de Nerville, criticising Caro's weakness for the good things of the table, once exclaimed sharply: "Je croirais à l'amour de Caro quand il aura pour objet une dame n'ayant qu'une bonne." *Mme Aubernon et ses amis*, p. 154.

<sup>12</sup> See the *Bulletin* of the society, to be obtained from M. Bert, in care of the newspaper, *le XXe Siècle*, Brussels.

<sup>13</sup> In a letter dated Feb. 28, 1926. <sup>14</sup> 55, rue de Verneuil, Paris.

nevertheless that Pailleron "took no precautions," as he put it, before bringing Bellac on the stage.

The drawing room of Mme de Blocqueville, where Caro used to be seen, was also mentioned in connection with Mme de Cérans, according to Mme Dussane, although she possessed no other information about that *salon*. She added: "Le salon de Mme Aubernon fut également cité, en effet, et certainement avec raison . . . il y a beaucoup d'elle dans les admiratrices passionnées de Bellac."

Mme Dussane writes concerning the pun, "lauréat . . . mediocritas" (Act II, i) that it is credited to the Assyriologist, Jules Oppert, who pronounced it of one of his rivals about 1875. She says that there were many models in Pailleron's day for the savant Saint-Réault, "celui dont le père avait tant de talent." This was once said, but unjustly, of Eugène Burnouf, and with more truth of Hartwig Derenbourg fils, a specialist in Arabic, who had been pushed too much by his father Joseph Derenbourg, an authority on Semitic languages, and a directeur d'études at the École des Hautes Etudes. Concerning Toulonnier, the man of many promises in this play, Des Millets the poet, the bored General Briaïs and the other minor characters of the comedy, Mme Dussane says that she had never heard that they were thought to be personal portraits.

Although Pailleron, when defending himself from charges of personal caricature, said in his preface that as many as five different names had been mentioned in connection with each of his characters, I conclude from Mme Dussane's statement, from the silence of the writers of memoirs, and from M. Koechlin's remarks to me, that only a few of Pailleron's types were widely recognized as caricatures in his day. His characters are creatures drawn from his experiences in academic society, and his art therefore is higher than that of mere imitation. I believe that my readers will be glad to join me in thanking Mme Dussane for these sidelights on the society in which Pailleron was bored.<sup>17</sup>

Stanford University

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

<sup>15</sup> *R. D. M.* mai, 1881, p. 222.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224.

<sup>17</sup> P. was elected to the Academy Dec. 7, 1882, and not in 1884 as Dr. W. R. Price and Profs. Reed and Brooks declare in their editions of the play. They may have confused this date with that of his reception as member, Jan. 17, 1884.

## FOUR NOTES ON THE WEST MIDLAND DIALECT

1. ME. *yord* < OE. *geārd*; ME. *yōrn* < OE. *geār̃n*.

It does not seem to have been observed that ME. *yerd*, *yard*, is occasionally found in the form *yord* (*zorde*) in the West and North-west Midland. This form occurs in Erkenwald 88, 'zorde'; Mirk's *Festial*, 'chyrch-zorde.' 179/24, 297/27, 28; *Liverpool Town Books*, ed. Twemlow, I, 406, 'yorde and gardyn' (entry of 1569). It is recorded as a variant in the *Promptorium Parvulorum* 537/2: 'zerd, or zorde, ortus.' That its geographical distribution was limited in Middle English is indicated by the fact that the form *yord* is recorded in the *English Dialect Dictionary* only for Shropshire, and *yort*, with the unvoicing of the final consonant frequently found in the West Midland, only for Lancashire. Similarly, *yorn* for *yarn* is cited by the *NED.* for Staffordshire in 1552-3, from the 'Inv. Ch. Goods, Stafford in Ann. Lichfield, 1863.' In the *EDD.* it is recorded for Lancashire only.

The phonological development involves an early shifting of the diphthongal stress to the second element of the diphthong (*géard* to *geárd*),<sup>1</sup> since the lengthening to *ā* must have occurred in Old English times in order to take part in the twelfth-century development of *ā* to *ō*. Thus we have ME. *yōrd* < OE. *geārd*, besides *yērd* from OE. *gēard*, and *yārd* from OE. *geard* without lengthening. Jordan, *Handbuch der ME. Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1925) § 60, notes *shōrd* beside *shērd* and *shard*. But in *shord* beside *shard*, and *shorn* 'cow-dung' beside *sharn* (OE. *scearn*), the Middle English forms with *o* (see *NED.*) are not limited to the West Midland, and in modern dialects *shord* is predominantly South-western, and *shorn* is found in Kent and Sussex as well as in Devonshire. It may be worth noting that diphthongal shifting, though of wide distribution in some words, e. g. *shōwe(n)* < *sceāwian*, seems to have been especially developed or preserved in the West Midland in such forms as *zōp* < *geāp* for *gēap* (Mirk, *Destruction of Troy, Wars of Alexander*) and *chōst* < *cēast* for *cēast* (Mirk).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Luick, *Historische Grammatik* § 265, on such 'Akzentumsprung.'

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jordan § 81, Anm. 1 and § 84 Anm. 4, and for further material, not always correctly interpreted, Wood, *JEGPh.* xiv, 499-568, esp. p. 507.

2. ME. Final *i* > *e*.

The extent to which final *i*, *y* (generally from OE. *-ig*, *-ī*) is written *é* in the West Midland of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries has not been recognized. Luick, after noting that *i* before a consonant does not appear as *e* (*lyeng*) until the fifteenth century, remarks that "genau dasselbe gilt für auslautendes *i*, wofür erst spät und selten *-e* auftaucht (*hōle* 'heilig') und im 16. Jahrhundert ebenfalls ein hellerer Laut bezeugt ist." Emerson in 'Some Notes on the *Pearl*'<sup>3</sup> called attention to the frequency of the spelling in the *Pearl* manuscript: *pene*, 'penny,' *Pearl* 510, 562; *prette*, *Purity* 317; *fyfte*, 'fifty,' *Purity* 442; *bode*, 'body,' *Gawain* 357; *lade*, 'lady,' *Gawain* 1810. In citing the frequency of this spelling in the Cotton manuscript of *Cursor Mundi*, Emerson fails to note the important fact that the Cotton manuscript, like the Fairfax manuscript, was probably written by a scribe who lived in the West. The Cotton manuscript, says Hupe, 'is written by a scribe who lived in the same district' [i. e., as the scribe of the *Pearl*].<sup>4</sup>

In reality, many of the texts generally assigned to the North-west Midland and West Midland proper show this peculiarity. In the *Wars of Alexander* endings in *-e* appear in the Ashmole manuscript, the older and better of the two manuscripts extant, for example: *mane*, 'many,' 104; *angrile*, 733; *bode*, 'body,' 192, 2444; *jolye*, 705; *rede*, 'ready,' 3534; *mode*, 'brave,' 215, 705, 5399; *selle*, 'strange,' 89, 4884. The *Destruction of Troy* has *folle*, 'folly,' 1957; *mode*, 7449, *sore*, 'sorry' 10445; *were*, 'weary,' 4579. The Ireland manuscript (ed. Robson) probably written in Lancashire, has in the *Anters of Arther*, such forms as *ladé(s)* XLII, 5; XLVIII, 10; *ferlés*, XXIII, 13; *weré*, XLIX, 6;<sup>5</sup> and in Sir Amadace forms like *hastelé*, 'hastily,' XI, 3; *Maré*, 'Mary,' XXII, 7; *curtasé*, 'courtesy,' XXXVII, 11; and *men(n)é*, 'meinie,' XI, 4; LXVI, 4. In

<sup>3</sup> *PMLA*. xxxvii, 52-93, especially pp. 56-7.

<sup>4</sup> "On the Filiation of the MSS. of the *Cursor Mundi*," in EETS. LVII, p. \*128; cf. p. \*130.

<sup>5</sup> The Douce and Thornton manuscripts printed by Amours, *Scottish Alliterative Poems*, Scottish Text Society, xxvii, have *-y* or *-ye* in these cases, except in XLIV, 5, where Thornton, too, has *lade*; but all these manuscripts are far removed from the original. Cf. Amours, p. xliii.

Mirk's *Festial* such forms appear occasionally, but in John Audelay (ed. Halliwell, Percy Society xiv) the ending is so frequent that it is one of the striking characteristics of Audelay's language. Such forms as *dedlé* (p. 1) *ludé*, *moné* (p. 4), *holé*, 'holy,' (p. 5) and even *mercé*, 'mercy' (p. 6) appear constantly, and similar forms are everywhere rhymed with words like *me* and *be*—for example, pages 6, 7, where *me*, *oponlé*, *petuysly*, *be* rhyme together, and also *be*, *peté*, *mercé*.

Two explanations of these spellings are possible. Emerson suggests, at least for the *Cursor*, that the change of final *e* to *i* . . . had become so frequent in Northern English that either *e* or *i* (*y*) might be used for the sound.<sup>6</sup> The *e* forms would thus be inverted spellings, not indicating a change from *i* to *e*, but reflecting a change from original *e* to *i* (e. g. *pite* > *piti*), where the retention of the original spelling for the new sound made the use of *e* possible even for original *i*. The fact that the *Gawain* manuscript is one of the earliest in which occur forms like *city*, *pyty*, *bounty* (Luick § 466, Anm. 1) might seem to support this suggestion. Audelay's rhymes do not preclude this interpretation. For though he rhymes *be* with *oponlé*, which would seem to indicate that *é* = *ē*, he also rhymes *glotoné* with *cry* (p. 56) and *sudaré* with *dye* (p. 57), which would seem to indicate that *é* = *ī*. When, however, Audelay rhymes *se* with *lye* (p. 78), one can only conclude that he is a careless rhymster in this as in other respects.<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, the great frequency of the *-e* spellings and their geographical limitation render unlikely the assumption that they are merely orthographical peculiarities. If these spellings were a mere reflection of a sound-change from *-e* to *-ī*, we should expect more direct evidence of this sound-change in the manuscripts which show *-e* for original *-ī*. It may well be that in the dialects represented by the manuscripts mentioned, *i* had actually

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>7</sup> One could, of course, conceive of Audelay's rhymes as correct, by assuming that stressed *ē* had even at so early a date become *ī* in his dialect, *be* having its modern pronunciation. In that case, all these rhymes would have final *ī*. Audelay's carelessness in other respects makes this a dangerous assumption. It is quite possible, too, that in a word like *mercé*, the final *e* is due to re-stressing. On the analogy of such pairs as *pité*: *merci* would be re-stressed *mercé*.



been shifted in the direction of *e* to such an extent that it was often represented by *e* in spelling. This sound-change would correspond phonetically to the process by which West Midland unstressed *e* before single final consonants tended to become a lower vowel expressed in spelling by *u*. Thus *-i* > *e*, just as *-ed*, *-es*, *-en* > *-ud*, *-us*, *-un*. But, however interpreted, such spellings in *-e* are distinctly characteristic of the West and Northwest Midland.

### 3. *þo*, 'the.'

Holmqvist, in his monograph *On the History of the English Present Inflections, particularly -th and -s* (Heidelberg, 1922), pp. 146-7, notes the use of *þo* as the regular form of the article in the *Boke of Cortasye* and certain Wycliffite tracts from Bodleian 647 and Douce 273 edited by Thomas Arnold in the third volume of his *Selected Works of Wycliffe*, and also in a few brief Northern (Northwestern?) texts. Holmqvist is inclined to think that while the form *þo* was used over a comparatively large area of the Midlands, it was rather Central or Western than Eastern. This is substantiated by its occurrence in two Northwestern documents, one the indenture of 1417/8, mentioned below in connection with *hor*, (and published in the *Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Proceedings and Papers, Session III*, 1850-1, p. 107), where *þo* is regularly used (spelled *yo*), as in the phrase 'yo awarde and yo ordenaunce,' and the other in a document of the Vernon family printed in Ormerod's *History of Cheshire*, 2d ed., III, 246-7,<sup>8</sup> where *yo* is constantly used. The form, then, may be considered characteristic of the Northwestern and perhaps Central Midlands, though it would be rash to say that it is never found in the East. If a westernism, it may possibly be connected with the darkening of unstressed vowels that is characteristic of the West (cf. *os* for *as*, Mirk's *Festial*, 243/26 and frequently; *meroly* for *merily*, 152/36; *doses* for *dises* 14/6 and frequently.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> This is a copy of an original document, of about the reign of Henry V, in the handwriting of the antiquary Augustine Vincent, d. 1626; but the Middle English orthography is patently preserved.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Western *-us*, *-ud*, *-un*, *-on*, Jordan § 135 and Anm. 1.

## 4. Hor, 'their.'

The use of *hor* (OE. *heora*) as the possessive plural pronoun is well recognized as a characteristic of the West Midland or South-western dialects (Wyld, *Short History of the English Language* § 306; Jordan § 151). It is perhaps worth noting that it persists in the West Midland later than in the Southwest. I have never run across it in fifteenth-century documents from Gloucester or elsewhere in the south, whereas it is found in the Northwest Midland not only in the *Boke of Corlasye*, the *Liber Cure Cucorum*, regularly in Mirk's *Festial*, and occasionally in Audelay's *Poems*, but—what is more important for the study of dialect—in numerous local documents from 1400 to 1450. To three Lancashire charters, listed in a previous article,<sup>10</sup> and dated 1407?, 1417/8, 1429/30, may now be added two others from Lancashire and Cheshire. Both are unprinted charters in the British Museum collections relating to the family of Aston. In the first, Additional Charter 51000, a Chester document dated 1418, *hor* occurs three times; and in Additional Charter 52293, from Lancashire, dated 1446, *hor* occurs once.<sup>11</sup> Another Cheshire document of about the reign of Henry V, printed in Ormerod's *Cheshire*, 2d ed., III, 246-7, contains *hor* (incorrectly spelled *hoz*). Finally, the use of *hor* in Stafford is found twice in a charter of Stafford dated 1447, printed by Morsbach.<sup>12</sup>

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

---

## HORACE WALPOLE ANTICIPATES VICTOR HUGO

Souriau, in his excellently documented definitive edition of *la Préface de Cromwell*, gives numerous references to the sources of the manifesto and at many points lists precedents, but he repre-

<sup>10</sup> *PMLA.* XXXVII, 522-3.

<sup>11</sup> For details, see *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1900-1905* (London, 1907), pp. 411, 416, 417.

<sup>12</sup> *Mittelenglische Originalurkunden von der Chaucer-Zeit bis zur Mitte des XV Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg, 1923), pp. 40-1. It may be worth noting that the corresponding personal pronoun *hom* occurs in this document and likewise in Add. Ch. 52293.

sents the doctrine of the grotesque, "la théorie capitale de Victor Hugo,"<sup>1</sup> as original and new.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore of interest to find this same theory in germ, and even partially developed, more than a half-century earlier, in the book of an Englishman who not only points to the example of Shakespeare, as Hugo is to do, but who finds further authority for his views in France, in Voltaire.

My reference is to Horace Walpole's preface to the second edition (1765) of his *Castle of Otranto*. Walpole makes his point apropos of the domestics of his story, whose uncouth deportment, he says, may have seemed out of keeping with the tragic tone of the narrative:

The simplicity of their behaviour, almost tending to excite smiles, which, at first, seems not consonant to the serious cast of the work, appeared to me not only not improper, but was marked designedly in that manner. My rule was nature. However grave, important, or even melancholy, the sensations of princes and heroes may be, they do not stamp the same affections on their domestics: at least the latter do not, or should not be made to, express their passions in the same dignified tone. In my humble opinion, the contrast between the sublime of the one and the naiveté of the other, sets the pathetic of the former in a stronger light. The very impatience which a reader feels, while delayed, by the coarse pleasantries of vulgar actors, from arriving at the knowledge of the important catastrophe he expects, perhaps heightens, certainly proves that he has been artfully interested in, the depending event. But I had higher authority than my own opinion for this conduct. That great master of nature, SHAKESPEARE, was the model I copied. Let me ask, if his tragedies of *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar* would not lose a considerable share of their spirit and wonderful beauties, if the humour of the grave-diggers, the fooleries of Polonius, and the clumsy jests of the Roman citizens, were omitted, or vested in heroics? Is not the eloquence of Antony, the nobler and affectedly-unaffected oration of Brutus, artificially exalted by the rude bursts of nature from the mouths of their auditors? These touches remind one of the Grecian sculptor, who, to convey the idea of a Colossus, within the dimensions of a seal, inserted a little boy measuring his thumb.

"No," says Voltaire, in his edition of Corneille, "this mixture of buffoonery and solemnity is intolerable."—Voltaire is a genius—but not of Shakespeare's magnitude. Without recurring to disputable authority, I appeal from Voltaire to himself. I shall not avail myself of his former encomiums on our mighty poet; though the French critic has twice translated the same speech in *Hamlet*, some years ago in admiration, latterly in derision; and I am sorry to find that his judgment grows weaker when it

---

<sup>1</sup> Maurice Souriau, *la Préface de Cromwell*, Paris, Boivin, 10e édition, p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, pp. 136 ff.

ought to be farther matured. But I shall make use of his own words, delivered on the general topic of the theatre, when he was neither thinking to recommend or decry Shakespeare's practice; consequently, at a moment when Voltaire was impartial. In the preface to his *Enfant Prodigue*, that exquisite piece, of which I declare my admiration, and which, should I live twenty years longer, I trust I shall never attempt to ridicule, he has these words, speaking of comedy, (but equally applicable to tragedy, if tragedy is, as surely it ought to be, a picture of human life; nor can I conceive why occasional pleasantry ought more to be banished from the tragic scene, than pathetic seriousness from the comic,) '*On y voit un mélange de sérieux et de plaisanterie, de comique et de touchant; souvent même une seule aventure produit tous ces contrastes. Rien n'est si commun qu'une maison dans laquelle un père gronde, une fille occupée de sa passion pleine; le fils se moque des deux, et quelques parents prennent différemment part à la scène, etc. Nous n'inférons pas de là que toute comédie doive avoir des scènes de bouffonnerie et des scènes attendrissantes: il y a beaucoup de très bonnes pièces où il ne règne que de la gaieté; d'autres toutes sérieuses; d'autres mélangées: d'autres où l'attendrissement va jusques aux larmes: il ne faut donner l'exclusion à aucun genre; et si on me demandait, quel genre est le meilleur, je répondrais, celui qui est le mieux traité.*' Surely if a comedy may be toute sérieuse, tragedy may now and then, soberly, be indulged in a smile. Who shall proscribe it?<sup>3</sup>

Walpole, after observing that Voltaire makes a similar point in the epistle to Maffei published with *Mérope*, takes exception to certain of Voltaire's comments on other subjects and concludes by placing himself again under the canon of Shakespeare.

The remarks of this preface became the subject of a brief correspondence between Walpole and Voltaire,<sup>4</sup> but there is little further discussion of the grotesque and the French writer withdraws to a position more in accord with his usual objections to "des plaisanteries d'hommes grossiers à côté du sublime des héros."<sup>5</sup>

*The Castle of Otranto* was translated into French as early as 1767, and Walpole's views on the grotesque had some publicity in France in the next few years,<sup>6</sup> but I do not suggest that Hugo in 1827 is likely to have been reading the passage quoted.

<sup>3</sup> Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, New York, Stokes, N. D., pp. lvii-lxi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, Oxford, 1903, I, xlix; VII, 199-202, 206-207. Cf. also *id.*, I, 1. For Voltaire, cf. *Œuvres Complètes*, Paris, Garnier, 1882, XLVI, 78-85.

<sup>5</sup> Voltaire, *op. cit.*, XXXI, 203. This may be the passage in the *Commentaires sur Corneille* referred to by Walpole.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Killen, A., *Le Roman terrifiant ou roman noir de Walpole à Anne Radcliffe*, etc., Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. 74-78.

Hugo, it is known, was very familiar with Voltaire and cites him frequently in the *Préface*.<sup>7</sup> In 1823 Hugo had written a juvenile article on the author of *Méropé* in which he had stated "un examen approfondi de l'œuvre dramatique de Voltaire nous a convaincu de sa haute supériorité au théâtre."<sup>8</sup> He could hardly have been unaware of the preface to *l'Enfant Prodigue*. Perhaps his mind registered the detail as his very juvenile eye had recorded the grotesque figure seen at the Cathedral of Burgos,<sup>9</sup> although we know he was more susceptible to images than to ideas.

In any case, giving up the puzzle of sources, which seems more bewildering than ever since the recent demonstration that Bernard Shaw had never read the "source" of *Pygmalion*,<sup>10</sup> here is more good evidence that Hugo's "théorie capitale" was far from new.<sup>11</sup> Above all mark Walpole's two principal reasons for advocating the juxtaposition of the two elements: (1) he wants them together in art because he finds them in company in life ("my rule is nature"); (2) he believes that the contrast "sets the pathetic . . . in a stronger light." This is a sufficiently close parallel to Hugo's generalizations: (1) "que tout dans la création n'est pas humainement beau, que le laid y existe à côté beau";<sup>12</sup> (2) "Il semble . . . que le grotesque soit un temps d'arrêt, un terme de comparaison, un point de départ d'où l'on s'élève vers le beau avec une perception plus fraîche et plus excitée."<sup>13</sup>

HORATIO E. SMITH.

*Brown University.*

<sup>7</sup> Pp. 217, 249, 292, 314. Souriau points out certain reminiscences of Voltaire in the *Préface* (pp. 220, 225, 318).

<sup>8</sup> *Littérature et philosophie mêlées*, Paris, Hetzel, p. 169. Cf. Faguet, who states that Voltaire had great influence on "la tragédie de Victor Hugo" (*Dix-Huitième Siècle*, Paris, Boivin, p. 288).

<sup>9</sup> *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin*, Paris, Hetzel, I, 101 (chapter XVIII), cited by Souriau, *op. cit.*, p. 14. Walpole's specialization in the "gothic" dates, it has been suggested, from his inspection of cathedrals. Cf. Killen, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *MLN*, May, 1926, pp. 327-330.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. on the earlier development of the grotesque in Nodier, Schenck, *la Part de Charles Nodier*, etc., Paris, Champion, 1914.

<sup>12</sup> *Préface*, p. 191.

<sup>13</sup> *Préface*, p. 203.

## A NEGLECTED SIXTEENTH-CENTURY "OF-OR" CONSTRUCTION

For lack of evidence that it is a genuine English idiom, the unusual "of-or" construction in Shakespeare has not been recognized in W. Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik* or in the *New English Dictionary*. The two Shakespearean examples of this construction are found in the following passages:

Now follow, if thou dar'st, to try *whose right*,  
Of *thine* or *mine*, is most in Helena.

*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, III, ii, 336-337.

Which, of *he* or *Adrian*, for a good wager,  
First begins to crow?

*The Tempest*, II, i, 27.

In these two instances, this construction has been held suspect by the older editors of Shakespeare.<sup>1</sup> More recent editors of Shakespeare, on the other hand, with here and there an exception,<sup>2</sup> have restored the folio readings rejected by the earlier editors. This they have done upon the evidence of a single example from Sidney's *Arcadia*. The example from Sidney is as follows:

the question arising *who should be the former* against Phalantus, of the blacke, or the ill-apparelled knight, . . .<sup>3</sup>

I submit the following examples as further evidence that this construction, now obsolete, was a normal English idiom of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and deserves to be recognized in a complete account of the language of Shakespeare's day:

*A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure*, 1576, by George Pettie, edited by I. Gollancz, 1908, Vol. I, p. 70: "It were hard here, Gentlewomen, for you to give sentence, *who more offended of the husband or the wife*, seeing

<sup>1</sup> Until the middle of the nineteenth century editors of Shakespeare generally accepted Theobald's emendation of "or" for the folio "of," in the passage in *The Tempest*; and followed Rowe in his substitution of "Which of them, he" for the folio "Which, of he," in the passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oxford Shakespeare*, edited by W. G. Craig, 1912, followed by the *Yale Shakespeare*, 1918, retains Theobald's substitution of "or" for "of," in the passage from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, edited by A. Feuillerat, p. 110.

the doings of both the one and the other near in the highest degree of devilishness. . . ."

*The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo*, translated by George Pettie, 1581, *The Tudor Translations*, Second Series, 1925, Vol. I, p. 22: "I should bee verie glad (if it might so please you) wee might enter into argument, *which is more availeable to mans state of solitarines or conversation*, for I would be loth. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 88: "And I am in doubt *whether bee the greater offence of him that slaunderously reproveth the good, or of him that flatteringly commendeth the evill.*"<sup>5</sup>

*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 94: "And as one of them asked him *whiche eye of the right, or of the left*, was able to discern a thing furthest: . . ."<sup>6</sup>

*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 5: "And I know not *which I may count greater, of the jelousie which is entred into the husband, or of the suspicion which is given by the wife.*"<sup>7</sup>

*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 64: "Now we are fallen upon this Example, I woulde gladly know of you, in this difference of degree and calling, *which ought to go formost, of the father or the sonne?*"<sup>8</sup>

*Have with You to Saffron-Walden*, by Thomas Nashe, McKerrow ed., Vol. III, p. 59, l. 33-35: "So that herein it is hard to distinguish *which is most to be blamed, of the cause or the effect;* . . ."

*The Raigne of King Edvard the Third*, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke, p. 97 (IV, ix, 15): "Who now of you or I haue need to praie?"

*All Fools*, by George Chapman, in *The Comedies of George Chapman*, edited by Thomas Marc Parrott, p. 123 (II, i, 204-206):

"Indeed, I must commend thy wit, of force;  
And yet I know not *whose deserves most praise*  
*Of thine or my wit:* . . ."

*The First Part of the Honest Whore*, by Thomas Dekker, in *The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists*, edited by William Allan Neilson, p. 412 (IV, i, 93-94): "What youth? Of man or woman? Lock the doors."

<sup>4</sup> *La Civil Conversatione*, del Sig. Stefano Gvazzo, Vinegia, 1579, 4<sup>1</sup>-4<sup>2</sup>: qual più gioueuole allo stato dell' huomo, ò la solitudine, ò la conuersatione.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 28<sup>2</sup>: Nè qui saprei bē dire qual sia più graue fallo, ò di colui, che co'l maldire bia sima i buoni, ò di colui, che con l'adulare loda i cattiuu.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 29<sup>2</sup>: et dimandan dogli già un perfidioso, qual occhio uegga più lontano il dritto, o'l māco, . . .

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 91<sup>1</sup>: nè saprei dire qual sia maggiore, ò la gelosia, che riceue il marito, ò'l sospetto, che dà la moglie.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 116<sup>1</sup>: Poi che siamo caduti in questo essemplio saprei uolētieri da uoi, stando questa disparità de' gradi tra loro, a cui tocchi la precedēza, ò al padre, ò al figliuolo.

It seems fairly clear that the use arises by an ellipse from the common *which* (or *who*) of them, of the two, etc. This accounts for the nominative pronouns, *he*, *I*, being employed: "who of us, you or I," etc. Logically, when the word governed by *of* was dropped, the conjunction should have become *and*: "Who of you-and-me." "

M. P. TILLEY.

*University of Michigan.*

---

### BLAKE AND BROWNING

The *Reminiscences* of that accurate, unimaginative friend of poets, Crabb Robinson, contains a noteworthy record of the impression made by William Blake on one who first met him. "There was nothing *wild* about his look," writes Robinson (who was prepared to find the old poet peculiar, if not mad), "and though very ready to be drawn out to the assertion of his favourite ideas, yet with no warmth as if he wanted to make proselytes. Indeed one of the peculiar features of his scheme, as far as it was consistent, was indifference and a very extraordinary degree of tolerance and satisfaction with what had taken place. A sort of pious and humble optimism, not the scornful optimism of *Candide*. But at the same time that he was very ready to praise he seemed incapable of envy, as he was of discontent. . . . The wildest of his assertions was made with the veriest indifference of tone, as if altogether insignificant."<sup>1</sup>

This account is interesting not only for the general ideas it suggests and for the light it throws on Blake's personality, but for the parallel it offers to the unusual conception of the risen Lazarus found in Browning's *Epistle*. The poem is too familiar to require

<sup>0</sup> I am indebted to Professor W. A. Craigie for the explanation of the origin of the use.

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences*, quoted in Arthur Symonds' *William Blake* (1907), pp. 286, 291. The section quoted from is dated "23/2/52," that is, twenty-seven years after the meeting occurred. It was first published in Gilchrist's life of Blake (1863, i, 338 sq.).



quotation and too long to permit it, but the most significant passage should be before us:

He even seeketh not to please God more  
 (Which meaneth, otherwise) than as God please.  
 Hence, I perceive not he affects to preach  
 The doctrine of his sect whate'er it be,  
 Make proselytes as madmen thirst to do:  
 . . . Ardent as he is—  
 Call his great truth a lie, why, still the old  
 "Be it as God please" reassureth him. . . .  
 "How, beast," said I, "this stolid carelessness  
 Sufficeth thee, when Rome is on her march  
 To stamp out like a little spark thy town,  
 Thy tribe, thy crazy tale and thee at once?"  
 He merely looked with his large eyes on me.  
 The man is apathetic, you deduce?  
 Contrariwise, he loves both old and young,  
 Able and weak, affects the very brutes  
 And birds—how say I? flowers of the field—<sup>2</sup>

These last lines recall Blake's love for children, animals and flowers. Robinson's opinion that Blake was "insane" is paralleled by Karshish's words "our patient Lazarus is stark mad" and Robinson's "He had . . . a look of languour, except when excited," by Karshish's

then back he sinks at once  
 To ashes, who was very fire before.<sup>3</sup>

The passages I have quoted from the *Reminiscences* are dated "23/2/52"; now, curiously enough, on the sixth of October of this same year Robinson met the Brownings and was attracted by them.<sup>4</sup> Whether there were more meetings before the middle of November when the poets returned to Florence or in 1855 when they again visited England to see to the publication of *An Epistle* and its fellow "Men and Women" we do not know, for only a small part of Robinson's diary has been published. It is possible

<sup>2</sup> *An Epistle*, ll. 211-29.

<sup>3</sup> *Reminiscences*, quoted by Symons, pp. 278, 285; *An Epistle*, ll. 263-4, 195-6.

<sup>4</sup> Robinson's *Diary*, etc. (New York, 1877), II, 425. As John Kenyon, who brought Robinson and the Brownings together, was an intimate friend of both, it seems likely that the meetings were repeated.

that the two men discussed Blake and that *An Epistle* was influenced by this discussion; but, quite apart from the question of influence, it is worth while bringing the two accounts together in the hope that the comparison may throw a little light from a new angle on one of the more arresting poems and one of the most remarkable personalities in English literature.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

### A NOTE ON *BEOWULF* 1231

During the feast held at the Danish court in honor of Beowulf and in celebration of the victory over Grendel, the Danish queen, Wealhþeow, approaches Beowulf, gives him presents, and addresses him in a speech which ends thus:

1228	Her is æghwylc eorl      oþrum getrywe, modes milde,      mandrihtne hold, þegnas syndon geþwære,      þeod ealgearo,
1231	druncne dryhtguman      doð swa ic bidde.

'Here every nobleman is true to his fellow, kindhearted, loyal to his lord, the thanes are united, the band of warriors is wholly ready, the retainers, flushed with wine, do as I ask.'

The queen begins by presenting the gifts; she then urges Beowulf to stand by her young sons, and hints at further gifts in the future. She praises Beowulf, and urges him again to give her son (Hreðric) his support. Then comes the passage which I have cited above. One would think that if conditions are as the queen paints them, the young prince will stand in no need of help from an outsider. But in fact the whole passage (vv. 1228-1231) is a piece of dramatic irony. When the time comes, the Danes will show themselves anything but loyal to their young lord, and Hreðric will fall at the hands of his cousin Hroðulf. The English poet could safely assume that his hearers knew the story of Hreðric's fall. He therefore puts into the queen's mouth a passage, in praise of the Danes, which must have seemed ironical indeed to his audience. The poor queen praises the loyalty of those very men who were so

soon to prove themselves traitors to her beloved son. And the highest pitch of irony is reached in the last verse: the retainers do what she asks!

The editors and commentators have one and all missed this point. Hence the poet's highly artistic and effective ironical climax is often looked upon as an ending so lame as to call for emendation! Matters are bettered by putting a stop after *dryhtguman*, changing *doð* to *do*, and interpreting the last half-line as a command (or plea) aimed directly at Beowulf. Even so conservative and sensitive a critic as Klaeber adopts this view, and Kock, who essays to defend the text (*Anglia* XLIV 246 f.), defends it on other grounds. I hope I have shown that the text stands in no need of emendation.

KEMP MALONE.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

## VOLTAIRE ET CHRISTOPHE DE BEAUMONT

En 1762 Christophe de Beaumont, archevêque de Paris, lançait son célèbre *Mandement* contre *l'Emile* de Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Il est intéressant de remarquer qu'en 1766 Voltaire, dans sa *Lettre au Docteur Jean-Jacques Pansophe*, s'inspira du *Mandement*. Voici les rapprochements que l'on peut faire:

On l'a vu invectiver contre les sciences qu'il cultivait. (P. ix, ed. Rey, Amsterdam, 1763.)

Il s'est fait le précepteur du genre humain pour le tromper . . . préconiser l'excellence de l'Evangile dont il détruisait les dogmes. (P. ix.)

Il avait abaissé l'homme jusqu'au rang des bêtes. . . (P. ix.)

Vous avez crié contre les sciences, et cultivé les sciences. (XXVI, 19, ed. Moland.)

Vous vous êtes fait le précepteur d'un certain Emile . . . et pour faire un bon chrétien vous détruisez la religion chrétienne. (P. 20.)

Rapprochez-vous sans cesse de l'état des bêtes. . . (P. 26.)

J. H. PILLIONNET.

*Harvard University.*

## TWO NOTES ON SENECA TRAGEDY

1. The Até of *Locrine*

Até, the goddess of revenge, appears at the beginning of each act of the tragedy of *Locrine*, interpreting the dumbshow which foreshadows the events of the act. She also speaks the epilogue of the tragedy. Mr. F. W. Moorman, describing the Até of *Locrine* in his article on *The Pre-Shakespearean Ghost*, *Modern Language Review*, I, 1906, p. 92, states that Até's speech "keeps slavishly to the Senecan model." In actuality she is in dress rather than in words a survival of the revengeful Fury of Seneca's *Thyestes*. Her speeches are impersonal, purely explanatory, each beginning with a line or two of Latin usually referring to the events of the ensuing act. Her prologue speech opens with "In poenam sectatur et umbra" which was probably used to establish the tone of the play as a revenge tragedy. Since these Latin lines are not Senecan one must look elsewhere for an explanation of Mr. Moorman's statement. Was he confusing the Até of *Locrine* with the Até of the prologue to Peele's *Arraignement of Paris*? The prologue of the latter play would form a suitable introduction to a tragedy. There Até's first lines are similar to those of the ghost of Thyestes in *Agamemnon*:

Condemned soul, Até, from lowest hell,  
And deadly rivers of th' infernal Jove,  
Where bloodless ghosts in pains of endless date  
Fill ruthless ears with never-ceasing cries,  
Behold, I come . . .

Thyestes in *Agam.* 1-2:

Opaca linquens Ditis inferni loca  
adsum profundo Tartari emissus specu . . .

## 2. The Senecan Ghost Misrepresented

Harvey Carson Grumbine in his edition of *The Misfortunes of Arthur* published in the *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xiv (Berlin, 1900), pp. 7-8, has devoted a paragraph to the Senecan ghost. The source of his information according to a footnote is Cunliffe's *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*. How-

ever, the paragraph contains misinformation which is not due to the source but to Mr. Grumbine's own generalization from insufficient data. He tells us that the ghost who appears at the opening of the first act in Senecan tragedy announces "his unflinching purpose to roam a lurid terror until his desire has been appeased." As a matter of fact the prologue ghosts, Thyestes in the *Agamemnon* and Tantalus in the *Thyestes*, return to Hades at the end of their respective prologues without indicating any intention of roaming the earth or awaiting revenge (*Agam.* 56; *Thy.* 121). The ghost of Gorlois in *The Misfortunes of Arthur* remains on earth until his revenge is accomplished; in the last act he says, "I gladly thus revengde returne" (V. ii, 36). Further, Mr. Grumbine states, referring to the ghost, "He often closes the play in exulting joy over the success of his awful plans, which had come to full fruition in the blood and thunder of the intervening five acts." This statement applies very well to the ghost of Gorlois, but has no basis of truth in Senecan ghost usage where the prologue ghost opens the action of the drama but never appears again. The dramatic unity produced by a second appearance of the ghost on the stage was unfortunately not developed by Seneca.

MARY V. BRAGINTON.

Mount Holyoke College.

## A RHETORICAL FIGURE IN SHAKESPEARE

For your brother and my sister no sooner met but they looked, no sooner looked but they loved, no sooner loved but they sighed, no sooner sighed but they asked one another the reason, no sooner knew the reason but they sought the remedy; and in these degrees have they made a pair of stairs to marriage.

*As You Like It*, 5. 2. 35 sqq.

It is odd that the editors have not observed that the words "degrees" and "pair of stairs" refer to the name of the figure of speech which the Greeks called *κλίμαξ* or the staircase and the Romans *gradatio* (making a staircase or series of steps), and of which "no sooner met . . . sought the remedy" is an example. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 9. 3. 55, illustrates it by a Latin translation of a famous passage in Demosthenes, *De Corona* § 179,

which Mr. A. W. Pickard—Cambridge, translated “and I did not speak thus, and then fail to move a motion; nor move a motion, and then fail to serve as envoy; nor serve as envoy, and then fail to persuade the Thebans.” We need not suppose that Shakespeare had read Quintilian, much less Demosthenes; but he had evidently had a remarkably good schoolmaster, and it was doubtless his teaching that impressed this figure on Shakespeare’s memory.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

*The University of Tasmania, Australia.*

---

### TOUTES FOR TOUS

Professor Henning has called attention (*M. L. N.*, 1921, pp. 438-9) to the use of *toutes* with a feminine noun to sum up a series of substantives, one or more of which may be masculine, as in the example, “le devoir, le dévouement, le sacrifice, *toutes choses* dont l’histoire est pleine,” where we should rather expect to find *tous*. In all but two of the cases cited, *choses* is the noun that has attracted the pronoun into its gender. His examples come from nineteenth century texts with the exception of one from La Fontaine’s fables. As it remains to be determined how old the construction is and to what extent it is confined to phrases in which the noun modified is *choses*, the following example is not without interest. It is found in the fourth book of the *Astrée*, which was written before d’Urfé’s death in 1625, though not published until 1627. I have used the second edition (Paris, Courbé, 1633), where it occurs on p. 1297 in a description of the siege of Marsilly by the King of Burgundy:

Avec ces Machines ils s’approchoient de la muraille, la sappoient & la renuersoient: il y auoit aussi des chats, & des chastels, que quelques vns nommoient Causias; il y auoit des Taupes, des Rats, & des Renardeaux, *toutes Machines* avec lesquelles ils approchoient la muraille à couuert.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Englische Wortkunde*, von PHILIPP ARONSTEIN. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1925. Pp. viii + 130.

In those romantic days, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when linguistic science was having a new birth, it was the fashion, in Germany at least, to marvel at the beauties and perfections of the English language. The German scholars were wont to make of English a product unique in linguistic history. By a series of miracles a miraculously perfect instrument of speech came into being. As the years rolled on, much of the fervor died away, but the old romantic marvel has by no means vanished. Too many learned men still look upon English as a speech apart from the general run of languages, a speech extraordinary, peculiar, strangely made, utterly different from its sister tongues in history and genius. The unfriendly call it an ugly duckling, the friendly make it a swan, but both look upon it as a sport rather than as a normal member of the Germanic family of languages. This naive attitude reappears in the book under review. Mr. Aronstein has written an interesting and instructive volume, but his romantic point of view colors all the facts which he brings forward, and prevents the beginner (for whom the work was written) from seeing where English belongs in the linguistic history of Europe.

To begin with, Mr. Aronstein sets up the familiar thesis that English is a mixed language. He points out, and easily proves in detail, that the English vocabulary is a hoard of words from many sources. This fact (and fact it is) seems to him enough to establish his thesis. But there is a weakness in the demonstration, a weakness which the author seems to have overlooked. His argument proves too much. Thus, Latin contains an enormous number of words taken from Greek. Is Latin therefore to be called a mixed language? Again, Danish swarms with words borrowed from Latin, German and French. Is Danish a mixed language? Irish is full of loan-words from Welsh, Latin and English. Does that mean that Irish is a mixed language? German itself has great numbers of borrowings, chiefly from Latin and French. In fact, it would be hard to find a language which has not borrowed many words from other languages at all stages of its history. The same thing holds for prehistoric times. The more we learn about the history of a language, the more numerous we find the loan-words to be. If we could go a couple of thousand years further back, the chances are that we should find the native words in any given language only a small proportion of its total vocabulary.

Mr. Aronstein's methods drive us to the absurdity of maintaining that all languages are in truth mixed languages.

If now we look more broadly at what may be called the outer history of English, we see that its loan-words reflect influences which played upon the other Germanic tongues as well. From the earliest historical period to the present day, Latin has been an important influence, and has contributed many a word to the Germanic vocabulary. Hence we find numerous borrowings from Latin in all the Germanic dialects. The difference between English and the other dialects in this respect has been one of degree rather than of kind. All the Germanic dialects have borrowed, and continue to borrow, liberally from Latin, but English has done more borrowing than the others. The same may be said of French. Everybody knows the profound influence of French on the English vocabulary, but it is perhaps less widely known that French had a profound influence on the vocabulary of German, of Dutch, of the Scandinavian tongues—in short, Germania generally. And when we come to contemporary additions to vocabulary, we find the same influences at work throughout Europe, just as in the previous centuries.

We may look at the same matter from yet another angle. English has the reputation (not altogether deserved) of being peculiarly hospitable to loan-words. It has a great capacity for digesting them, making them to all intents and purposes native. So far as this is true, English is simply carrying on the old Germanic custom. In early days, loan-words were hospitably received everywhere in Germania, and made part and parcel of the language. Hence the modern German regards Latin loans like *kaiser*, *koch*, *sicher*, *strasse* as German pure and undefiled. We Anglo-Saxons have kept up the old custom better than our Continental kinsmen.

So much for general criticism. There are a number of details which call for attention. On p. 1 the author tells us that the Germanic conquerors of England were Low Germans, and that their speech was closest kin to Old Saxon. But the Angles, Saxons and Jutes were Anglo-Frisians, not Low Germans, and Old English is most closely related to Frisian, not to Old Saxon or any other Low German dialect. *Money* (p. 6) is from French, not from Latin. The same is probably true of *cherry*. On pp. 9 ff. Mr. Aronstein classifies the most important English borrowings from French. His readers would have found these classifications more instructive, if he had given the corresponding German borrowings as well. Thus, under "kindred" we have English *uncle*, *aunt*, *family*, *cousin* and German *onkel*, *tante*, *familie*, *kusine*; under "legal and political terms," English *crown*, *state*, *minister*, *chancellor*, *parliament*, *party*, and German *krone*, *staat*, *minister*, *kanzler*, *parlament*, *partei*; under "titles," English *baron*, *prince*, *princess*, *secretary* and German *baron*, *prinz*, *prinzessin*, *sekretär*;



under "war terms," English *army, soldier, officer, sergeant, lieutenant, general, captain, marshal, lance, harness, banner, guard, spy, march* etc. and German *armee, soldat, offizier, sergeant, leutnant, general, kapitän, marschall, lanze, harnisch, banner, garde, spion, marschieren* etc. Such comparisons would make it plain what the author makes no effort to bring out: that French influence was not peculiar to English, but extended to the other Germanic languages as well.

On p. 11 the author discusses "hybridism," i. e., formations like *breakage*, where the base is native, the suffix French. He speaks of this as *eine erscheinung, die dem englischen eigentümlich ist, und die zeigt, dass die englische sprache . . . eine mischsprache geworden ist*. Again he proves too much. On this basis the German word *schweineerei*, with its native base and French suffix, demonstrates that German is a mixed language. And what of the good German suffix *-er*, got from Latin *-arius*? On p. 19 certain words are listed which are said to survive only in the dialects. But *delve* 'dig,' *sore* 'very' and *aye* 'yes' are familiar literary words in present-day English, while *dern* or *darn* is extremely common in colloquial use (see G. P. Krapp, *Eng. Lang. in Amer.* i, 118 ff.). *Behove, bliss, blissful* (p. 20) are freely used not only in verse but also in prose. *Yonder, lief, uncouth* are familiar colloquial as well as literary words. *Folk*, in the plural form *folks* (p. 21), is extremely common in ordinary speech.

The author mentions the suffix *-ock*, but takes it simply as a diminutive (p. 46). He seems to be unfamiliar with F. A. Wood's authoritative monograph (*Some Parallel Formations in English*). He mentions *hillock* and *bullock*, but not *havock, paddock, meacock, buttock*. On p. 52 the Biblical origin of the suffix *-ite* ought to have been noted. On p. 54 Mr. Aronstein equates the verbal suffix *-ize* with the German *-ieren*. He presumably does not mean that they are etymologically related, but a beginner might make that interpretation and come to grief. The German suffix appears in English in the words *domineer* and *commandeer*. On p. 103 we learn that in America *legs* is replaced by *benders, body* by *waist*. I hasten to assure the author that he has made a mistake! On p. 110 the name *Babbitt* might be added to *Forsyte* and *Sherlock Holmes*. Certainly it has now become a *Gattungsbegriff*.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

*Das hellenisch-deutsche Weltbild.* Einleitung in die Lebensgeschichte Schellings von GEORG STEFANSKY. Bonn, Friedrich Cohen, 1925. 226 pp.

This treatise was written in memory of Schelling's one hundred and fiftieth birthday. The author has made use of a good deal of unpublished material. He promises also an edition of Schelling's *Nachlass*, which he is preparing for the *Berliner Literatur-Archiv*, and which is to contain certain unpublished letters of Karl Schelling, a younger brother of the philosopher.

The purpose of the book is to show how the *deutsche Bewegung*, known in its literary aspects as the early Romantic movement, originated with a group of men from the country east of the Elbe, and in its philosophical phases was transmitted by Fichte to Schelling; and further how Schelling modified it, attempting a vital synthesis of Greek and German ideas. "Indem nun Schelling seinen grundlegenden Vergleich des Griechisch-Antiken und Christlich-Modernen vollzieht, entsteht das, was man sein hellenisch-deutsches Weltbild nennen kann: seinen Pantheismus der Phantasie. . . . Diese Konstruktion gehört zu den grössten und eigentümlichsten Leistungen unserer Literatur, weil in ihr das innerste Gefühl, der mächtigste Gedanke des Volkes gestaltet . . . ist. Das Streben nämlich, sich selbst in der Antike zu ergänzen." (P. 146.)

These sentences may serve to indicate the author's point of view and to explain the limitations of the title he has selected. There is no *Lebensgeschichte* in the conventional sense, biography being conceived of as "the history of a time that is fulfilled in a personality." The argument is abstract and impersonal, dealing almost exclusively with ideas and style.

*Die deutsche Bewegung* is outlined against the background of Kant and Jacobi, both characterized as rationalists. Stimulated indirectly by Spinoza (witness Friedrich Schlegel's *Rede über die Mythologie*) it introduced the idea of *Irrationalismus*, and in Herder this point of view originally became effective. The author ventures an explanation of what he calls a *Hauptfrage*, why this new movement, with its vital appreciation of history and poetry, came through Herder and at this time, and what its future course was. That the *Aufklärung* in Germany had no historical sense is accounted for by the lack of continuity in German historical traditions. Perhaps too exclusively so, for not only in Germany was the ideal of the time humanistic. In Winkelmann, we are told, historical understanding first appeared. And it was Herder who modified Winkelmann and Lessing by opposing their exaggerated emphasis on Greek art, preparing the way for a synthesis of *hellenisch* and *deutsch*. The author goes deeply here into the speculative value of this new evolutionary view of history, which

is described as the "Mittelpunkt von Schellings geistiger Persönlichkeit" (p. 76). The new generation had arrived at an attitude to life fundamentally different from that of Kant.

According to Stefansky this whole movement originated in three men: Winkelmann, Lessing and Herder, beyond whom the tradition does not extend (p. 77). "In ihrer ursprünglichen Art und Individualität muss daher die Quelle liegen. . . . Damit ist aber auch das Problem nicht weiter lösbar, da in der schöpferischen Fähigkeit, die unabhängig auftritt und die Geschichte bestimmt, der letzte und unzerstörbare Rest an Energie aufgespeichert ist, der den Kern aller Entwicklung ausmacht." This personality, however, is not to be conceived of as something disengaged and unconditioned. For the spiritual idea common to them all must be shown to be inborn and really coincident with that "Menschentum, wie es aus der Ahnenreihe des Individuums hervorgeht." Also this reference to heritage explains the turn of affairs in the history of thought, that is, "untrüglich nachweist, dass die Bewegung, die von Winkelmann, Lessing und Herder ausgeht, mit der neuen und anderen Blutkraft zusammenhängt, die in ihnen zur geistigen Handlung reif geworden ist." Fichte, also an East-Elbian, gave the movement a philosophical foundation, and his *ich-erfüllte Philosophie* became a new and vital *Weltanschauung*, yes, a religious and national confession (pp. 124, 136). Perhaps the simplicity of the picture is overdone in these passages, especially as far as religion goes, for Herder, and later Friedrich Schlegel, regarded this *ich-erfüllte Philosophie* as atheism.

From the importance the author attaches to this East-of-the-Elbe hypothesis, however stimulating and interesting that may be, it is disappointing that the supposed relationship between the racial history of that region and the men assumed to be conditioned by it is not explained more fully and convincingly. This is certainly the weakest part of the argument. Nor is the explanation of Schelling's modification of Fichte's original direction (p. 84) as a matter of his *stammhafte Verbundenheit* any more plausible. Fortunately the value of Stefansky's book does not lie in these assumptions (certainly unproved in this place) but in a close analysis of the ideas of the men that continued Kant into *Idealisms*.

The last chapter is perhaps the most interesting, giving an analysis of Schelling's brilliant, if iridescent, theories of Greek and Christian mythologies in their relation to each other. His views are strikingly related to Hölderlin's poetry, to Friedrich Schlegel's *Rede über die Mythologie*, and revealed in their final form as a program of national culture. The reviewer regrets that the limits imposed upon him do not permit a more adequate account of this thorough-going treatise.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Wesleyan University.

*Le mouvement des Idées dans l'Émigration Française (1789-1815).*

By FERNAND BALDENSPERGER. Paris: Librairie Plon. 1924.

2 vols. xv + 337 and 334 pp.

Les répercussions que devait exercer la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes sur les destinées intellectuelles et morales de la France ont été maintes fois étudiées. Jusqu'ici les historiens des mœurs et les historiens littéraires n'avaient accordé qu'une attention superficielle et passagère à un phénomène parallèle par lequel un siècle plus tard des milliers de Français quittèrent leur pays pour aller sur une terre étrangère se refaire une nouvelle vie ou attendre qu'un changement de régime leur permit de retourner dans leur patrie. Après vingt ans de recherches et de préparation, M. Baldensperger, grâce à deux volumes qui représentent un effort de synthèse considérable, nous met à même de combler cette lacune. Il faut le louer tout d'abord d'avoir eu le courage d'entreprendre une tâche d'aussi longue haleine et de l'avoir menée à bien. Il faut le féliciter encore plus peut-être d'avoir senti que le mouvement de l'émigration si important qu'il soit au point de vue de l'histoire des lettres devait être envisagé dans son ensemble, comme une étude psychologique et morale autant que littéraire.

L'émigration fut avant tout un cataclysme social qui dispersa et jeta aux quatre coins de l'Europe et jusqu'en Amérique les membres de la société la plus raffinée que la France ait jamais connue. Le contact direct avec des civilisations étrangères forçait ces cosmopolites en chambre à opérer une revision de leurs idées préconçues. L'Angleterre perdit à être vue de plus près, mais l'Allemagne remonta dans leur estime; ils découvrirent la Pologne, la Russie et surtout la Scandinavie et l'expérience même les convainquit de la relativité et de la variété des choses et des hommes (chapitres I, *Rupture de la Vie de Société* et II, *Les Explorateurs malgré eux*). Ils cherchèrent peu cependant à s'incorporer dans de nouveaux groupes nationaux; partout où ils allèrent leur incurable esprit de société leur fit désirer de se retrouver entre eux, à deux, à quatre ou à vingt, dans un salon ou dans l'arrière-boutique d'un libraire. Ils fondèrent des journaux, écrivirent beaucoup; mais partout, à Berlin, à Londres, à Philadelphie et jusque sur les bords de l'Ohio, ils s'attachèrent avant tout à ressusciter les charmes de la vie mondaine et les plaisirs de la conversation. Ils fréquentèrent les théâtres et s'habituèrent ainsi aux hardiesses qu'ils devaient retrouver sur la scène à leur retour d'exil; mais ils n'inventèrent pas de nouvelles formules et leurs mémoires nous les montrent incurablement légers et, sauf quelques rares exceptions, peu enclins à se refaire une nouvelle vie et à se tremper dans un nouveau courant (chapitres III, *Au Hasard des*

*Nouveaux Groupements*; IV, *Tréteaux et Coulisses*; V, *Mémoires Romanesques et Romans d'Exil*).

Quelques-uns d'entre eux cependant rentrent en eux-mêmes; la solitude, les longues réflexions mélancoliques les amènent à trouver en eux des sources inconnues de lyrisme. Ils étaient partis soit pour des raisons personnelles, soit par sentiment d'un devoir de caste et de loyalisme monarchique, le plus souvent pensant revenir au bout de quelques mois ou de quelques années. L'exil se prolongeant, ils furent insensiblement conduits à se retourner de plus en plus en pensée vers la terre de leur naissance; ils souffrirent de plus en plus du mal du pays. C'est ainsi que l'auteur est conduit au problème le plus troublant et le plus difficile à élucider de son enquête et, à mon avis, le plus nouveau et le plus attirant. L'histoire désintéressée de l'idée de patrie en France étant encore à faire, on ne pourra lui reprocher de s'en être tenu strictement à ses émigrés. Par une apparente contradiction ce sont ces expatriés qui allèrent jusqu'à porter les armes contre leur pays et leurs compatriotes qui ont fait émerger et ont fait apparaître à la conscience un des principes les plus puissants du patriotisme moderne. Au point de vue strictement légal, ils n'avaient rien à se reprocher. Le droit d'expatriation est un droit naturel qui résulte de la conception du contrat social et qui était même reconnu par l'ancienne législation (Consulter sur ce point A. Weiss, *Manuel de droit international privé*, p. 123 et suiv.). L'auteur me permettra à ce propos de lui signaler le plaidoyer significatif que, dans *Les Natchez*, prononce Harlay, l'avocat de René et qui peut être considéré comme le plaidoyer de toute l'émigration. Mais, si juridiquement l'homme n'est pas attaché au sol sur lequel il est né, il n'en reste pas moins à déterminer dans quelle mesure il peut se déraciner moralement et sentimentalement. C'est encore à Chateaubriand qu'il faut revenir. Nul comme le remarque M. Baldensperger (I. 306, 307) n'a été plus profondément atteint par le "mal du pays" et nul n'en a plus souffert. La patrie absente pour ceux qui réfléchissent et qui sentent le plus cesse d'être le lieu où l'on avait goûté la douceur de vivre, son souvenir s'empreint de mélancolie; elle devient la terre des morts, celle où reposent les ancêtres auprès desquels l'émigré ne pourra dormir de son dernier sommeil. Il mourra sur la terre étrangère sans avoir la suprême consolation de mêler ses cendres à celles de ses aïeux. "C'est dans la surprenante destinée de Chamisso que ces conflits de sentiments ont trouvé leur expression et comme leur symbole mélancolique," dit M. Baldensperger, et c'est ainsi également que ces expatriés ont les premiers exprimé ce sentiment de solidarité avec les morts qui devait tenir une telle place dans la vie sentimentale des Français du dix-neuvième siècle.

Il était naturel pour les émigrés de chercher à déterminer les

causes du cataclysme qui avait bouleversé l'ordre social. Ce sont tout d'abord des causes mystérieuses auxquelles on s'arrête; on se plaît à faire retomber la responsabilité de la Révolution sur la "secte" des illuminés et des francs-maçons, on va jusqu'à retrouver chez eux les indications d'une conspiration anti-chrétienne et anti-monarchique préparée de longue main: puis les accusations se font plus précises et portent contre le "philosophisme" et les "lumières." C'est le complet désaveu de cette croyance au progrès et à la science qui avait lancé le dix-huitième siècle à la conquête d'un avenir meilleur. Certains qui restent plus clairvoyants et conservent dans l'adversité une plus juste vision des choses iront jusqu'à faire leur *mea culpa*; mais la grande majorité se contente d'explications moins directes et moins proches et voient dans la Révolution la faute de la fatalité, de la force des choses (Chateaubriand) ou la manifestation d'une providence dont nous ne pouvons sonder les desseins et qui punit pour régénérer (Joseph de Maistre, Livre II, *Prophètes du Passé*).

Si découragés qu'ils fussent et quel que fût le désarroi de leur existence, ils ne pouvaient cependant pas tous se consumer en vains regrets. Il n'est point dans la nature de l'homme de ne point songer à l'avenir. On ne pouvait s'attendre à des visions prophétiques ni à des systèmes bien équilibrés de la part de gens peu capables d'un grand effort de construction. Ils ne pouvaient guère qu'essayer de reconstituer le passé et de ramener la monarchie à sa pureté ancienne. C'est ainsi que ces exilés vont vivre en imagination non dans un rêve primitiviste ou exotique, mais dans un moyen âge qu'ils se plaisent à parer de toutes les perfectionnements. Dans le chapitre sur *La Résurrection du Bon Vieux Temps*, M. Baldensperger a indiqué avec précision et une grande pénétration les causes morales de ce retour au médiévalisme. En Allemagne, les émigrés avaient observé la survivance d'une époque disparue en France depuis plusieurs siècles. Il s'agissait d'en retrouver les traces dans le passé national, de démêler dans les chartes et les vieilles chroniques l'ancienne "constitution du royaume." Bien peu étaient capables d'un tel effort, mais le moyen âge pouvait au moins leur fournir un moyen de sortir d'eux-mêmes, de s'évader de la réalité et de satisfaire leur imagination. Aussi vont-ils se lancer à corps perdu dans la chevalerie et le genre troubadour dont le chef d'œuvre est probablement le recueil des *Poésies de Clotilde de Surville* (II, 160). Il ne s'agissait plus que de remonter en littérature comme en art dans le passé national pour reprendre une tradition que la Renaissance avait oblitérée.

Ce retour à la tradition nationale n'aurait été ni complet ni logique si l'on avait négligé la tradition religieuse. L'élégant scepticisme du dix-huitième siècle faisait partie de ce "philosophisme" que l'on rejetait. Beaucoup furent ramenés vers l'Eglise

par les deuils, les souffrances, le besoin instinctif de trouver un réconfort et un espoir. Il y eut de très belles vocations religieuses et une fièvre d'apostolat. C'est à ce moment que Chateaubriand écrit le *Génie du Christianisme*, bien plus, comme le remarque M. Baldensperger, comme "un témoignage de nostalgie" que pour "rebâtir la cathédrale." Considéré ainsi, comme un livre d'exil, le *Génie* se comprend, s'explique et s'éclaire et la conversion sincère bien que limitée de Chateaubriand devient moins miraculeuse et plus probable.

Il est impossible d'analyser en détail ce livre si riche en points de vues nouveaux et qui ouvre tant d'aperçus sur des régions encore mal connues de l'histoire littéraire. Un certain nombre de conclusions se dégagent cependant de cette longue étude et il sera désormais impossible d'étudier le mouvement romantique sans en tenir compte. La première qui semble s'imposer et qui causera sans doute une assez vive surprise aux adversaires comme aux amis de Jean-Jacques Rousseau est que Jean-Jacques n'a pas eu sur le développement du romantisme l'influence dominante, en bien ou en mal, que la plupart des critiques récents lui ont attribuée. Ici il faudrait peut-être distinguer encore plus nettement que ne l'a fait M. Baldensperger. Si l'influence de Rousseau est en effet assez faible sur la période dont il a retracé l'histoire, elle reparaitra plus forte que jamais après 1830. Mais il semble bien que le romantisme conservateur, épris de moyen âge, défenseur du trône et de l'autel de 1820 n'est sorti ni de la Révolution française ni de Rousseau; il est au contraire un produit de l'émigration. Ainsi s'explique la disparition et la faillite du primitivisme au commencement du dix-neuvième siècle. Chateaubriand lui-même n'ayant fait dans les *Natchez*, *Atala* et *René* que montrer l'impossibilité pour l'homme de se déraciner et de retourner à la nature. C'est vers le passé cependant que vont s'orienter les premiers romantiques, mais vers le passé national dans lequel ils chercheront à redécouvrir la foi naïve et forte des bâtisseurs de cathédrales et une tradition littéraire qui ne doit rien au rationalisme gréco-latin. On sait que le plus souvent ils n'y virent qu'un décor et qu'une mascarade; mais il serait vain de nier que c'est bien là en fin de compte que l'on peut trouver les germes de la résurrection du passé qui devait renouveler la conception de l'histoire. C'est aussi à l'émigration que l'on doit un renouveau de la vogue des littératures étrangères et en particulier des littératures du nord. Même si beaucoup des essais qui ont été tentés alors ont été maladroits, sans talent et sans grande intelligence, ils n'en ont pas moins contribué à créer des modes et à préparer l'éclosion du romantisme de 1820.

Comme on ne peut consacrer tant d'années à une étude sans s'empêtrer de son sujet, M. Baldensperger n'a pu se défendre dans

ses dernières pages de plader les circonstances atténuantes pour les émigrés. Il a indiqué en quelques lignes seulement un sujet qui mériterait d'être repris en détail et qui formerait le complément et la continuation des deux volumes qu'il vient de nous donner. Quand on a ainsi retracé l'histoire de l'émigration en se plaçant à un point de vue strictement français, on ne peut s'empêcher de se demander si les émigrés qui ont beaucoup reçu des pays où ils s'étaient réfugiés, leur ont apporté quelque chose. Sans aucun doute, ils ont comme les Huguenots contribué à la diffusion de la langue française; ils ont pu même, en des cas assez rares, inspirer un certain respect par leur attachement au point d'honneur et à la tradition. Je n'ai point qualité pour parler de l'Allemagne ou de l'Angleterre; en ce qui concerne les États-Unis au moins, je crains bien que leur influence n'ait été au total assez fâcheuse. Partout où ils sont allés, ils ont été forcément considérés comme des Français représentatifs, alors qu'ils n'étaient que des Français exceptionnels; mais je ne peux m'empêcher de me demander si par leur seule présence ils n'ont point renforcé la conception déjà trop générale du Français léger, élégant et galant, superficiel et manquant de sens pratique que l'on verra reparaître tant de fois au cours du siècle dans les pays où ils séjournèrent. M. Baldensperger mieux que tout autre pourrait répondre à ce qui est un doute et une question plus qu'une critique; il est permis d'espérer qu'il le fera dans une étude dont il doit déjà posséder les éléments essentiels.

Il serait inutile de signaler ici quelques-fautes d'impression évi-dentes qui disparaîtront dans une édition postérieure. Par contre cet ouvrage qui est un instrument de travail précieux auquel on se reportera souvent, et que l'on devra consulter pour l'histoire des lettres et des mœurs de 1789 à 1815, gagnerait beaucoup à avoir un index plus complet.

GILBERT CHINARD.

---

*Schillers Geisteshaltung als Bedingung seines dramatischen Schaffens*, von PAUL BÖCKMANN. [Hamburgische Texte u. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Philologie, Reihe II, No. 3.] Dortmund, 1925. viii, 163 pp.

This book is the outgrowth of a Hamburg dissertation. It is an interesting attempt to rescue Schiller's dramas from the deprecating comparison with Shakespeare, Goethe, and modern realism. The author represents Schiller's characters, his style, and his plots as the justifiable and natural outcome of a particular attitude to reality. The characters are masks, the style is abstract, the plots



are means to the realization and expression of a philosophy of life. Not a philosophy which could have been better expressed, perhaps, in a treatise, but which found its most adequate form, as far as Schiller is concerned, in the events and figures with which he peopled the stage. Schiller should be judged, it is affirmed, by his own standards and not by those of other men.

The argument itself is carried through with admirable clearness. Occasionally there is an approach, in the systematic procedure, to an elaboration of the obvious, but in general a good case is shown, especially in the discussion of fate, free will, religion, history and nature. The author outlines Schiller's *Geisteshaltung* on the basis of his theoretical essays and then traces out the workings of this dynamic view in every phase of his dramatic production. The essential thing is held to be Schiller's idea of man as a dualistic nature (*sinnlich-sittlich*), a conflict which he shows in every drama and raises moreover into the metaphysical sphere. It is curious that the author expressly leaves the early dramas, for the most part, out of consideration, as we may be certain that they would furnish good examples for almost every proposition put forward. No work of a poet is likely to be more truly characteristic of his genius than his first great success, for however crude it may be, it will inevitably contain all the essentials of his creative ability. It would seem unfortunate to omit them from this discussion.

Granting the premises of this book, the conclusion is logical: Schiller's style as a dramatist is unique, it is characteristic and consistent. All the various elements are organized from one dynamic point of view. But the resulting picture does not after all differ so much from that of the hostile critics, although the conclusions are stated more sympathetically. From the author's presentation we see Schiller's weakness and his own consciousness of it—namely his attitude to the real world. He got his experience largely at second hand. "Das Gemeine" that he left behind him neither affected his pure spirit nor made his poetry racy with the tang of life. From the present exposition especially is it apparent how Schiller forced everything he touched into an idealistic mould. Perhaps every writer does this—only the receptivity that precedes the creative reaction is different in degree and kind in each case. With Schiller the receptive stage was very slight. And when the author speaks of a *rationale Eigenschaftspsychologie*, of characters that are *statisch*, the poet's severest critics could ask no further concession. "Weil die Gestalten nicht in ihrem innersten Quellgebiet aufgesucht werden, scheinen auch diese Taten nicht eigentlich Emanationen eines ureigenen Wesens zu sein, sondern eher Resultate aus verschiedenen Grössen, die nach ihren Farb- und Helligkeitswerten zusammengestellt werden." "Im Grunde genommen zeigt dieses Verfahren nur, wie es Schiller gar nicht darauf ankommt, die letzte Eigenart eines Menschen zu fassen und

herauszustellen, sondern wie ihm auch die Mannigfaltigkeit der Charaktere nur ein Stoff ist, den er durch die Macht seiner ideellen Anschauung in sein Werk einschmelzen kann." (P. 136.) In short we might speak of Schiller as a Kantian expressionist.

Dr. Böckmann's book is a dispassionate and skillful apology for the often noticed weakness of a great poet.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Wesleyan University.

*An Oral French Grammar.* By CEPHAS GUILLET. New York. Alfred University Press, 1925.

Under a thin veneer of "dramatic presentation" and "conversation" the basic method employed in this first year book is that of comparison and translation. The vocabulary is poorly chosen. The following type of sentence is not infrequent, even in the oral drill. (P. 79): "The snake (serpent) puts his head out (sortir) of the water; the crayfish (écrivisse) pinches (pinces) my finger. (P. 122): Les chenilles des papillons sont-elles nuisibles? (rarement). Quand les teignes volent-elles?"

The chapter on pronunciation is little more than an abridgment in English of Martinon, *Comment on prononce le français*, to whom, it is true, credit is given (p. 253). The author has added a comparison of French and English sounds which contains frequent inaccuracies. Among others we note (pp. 9, 262) the vowel sounds in *foot* and *mud* given as the equivalents of French *eu* in *feu* and *neuf* respectively, and (p. 11) the distinction between closed and open *o* indicated by the English equivalents *holy* and *wholly*, a distinction apparent only to those acquainted with the New England provincial pronunciation of the latter word. We read (p. 277), "Put *f* instead of *d* in our *don't* and you have the French *fonte*." A knowledge of syllabification is said to be chiefly necessary for the proper dividing of words at the end of lines (p. 13)!

Reference vocabularies are omitted to avoid "social waste" (p. 4). There is no table of contents and only the briefest index, not arranged alphabetically, of the chief grammatical points treated. The book is therefore useless as a reference text, for which it might have had some value on account of the copiousness of the idiomatic matter introduced.

EUNICE R. GODDARD.

Goucher College.

*Studies in German Literature*, in Honor of Alexander Rudolph Hohlfeld by his Students and Colleagues. Presented on his Sixtieth Birthday, December 29, 1925. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 22. Madison, 1925. 268 pp.

No more highly valued tribute can be paid a scholar and teacher than the dedication to him during his lifetime of a volume of scholarly investigations by his students and colleagues. The *Festschrift* is none too frequent in this country, though the life-work of a professor is so generally measurable by his personal influence mainly, his preparing the way for others, instead of his devoting himself to a *magnum opus*.

There are compensations when the seed has fallen upon good soil, and happy the intellectual leader, as Professor Hohlfeld, who can see himself surrounded, long before his retiring age, by the living results of his labors in coöperative effort. No one in these states has devoted himself more untiringly and unselfishly to stimulating sound scholarly inquiry in the field of Germanics than Professor Hohlfeld, and the preparation of this gift-book is a token of recognition, upon which his friends throughout the land congratulate him sincerely and wholeheartedly.

The twelve contributions that compose the volume are representative of the high standard maintained by the German department of the University of Wisconsin, and are suggestive of the trend of present-day Germanic studies in this country. Four articles are devoted to Goethe, one to Schiller, two to Kleist (i. e. over one-half to the great period 1770-1832), two go back to the seventeenth century and earlier, three consider international influences, English, French and Russian. The philological-historical field of vision of an older generation has lost its privileged position, the new interest centering upon inquiries into the realm of the subconscious, the psycho-analytical.

Arranged in the alphabetical order of the contributors' names, the series begins with Professor A. W. Aron's *Anatole France and Goethe*. We are shown that from the beginning of his literary career (*les noces corinthiennes*) to 1921, when an epoch of never dying hatreds caused him to exclaim in Goethe's words *Be good Europeans*, Anatole France (France without the initial is misleading) always upheld the works of Goethe as one of his three highest cultural ideals. We may add the name Anatole France to the other brilliant stars, Victor Hugo, Ernest Renan and Romain Rolland, who caught and reflected the light of German genius.

Professor J. C. Blankenagel gives us a careful analysis of *Kleist's Pursuit of Happiness*, that inalienable right of man according to eighteenth century doctrine. Kleist unfortunately was not des-

tined to find Faust's solution in altruistic service, though he had passed similar dangerous cliffs, among them failure in the pursuit of knowledge.

*Die Motivierung aus dem Unbewussten bei Heinrich von Kleist* is a very thorough and suggestive study by Professor Friedrich Bruns, applying modern Freudian theories to the Romantic dream-world of the early nineteenth century. In Kleist's dramas we find the old tradition of taking dreams very seriously, as messages from Heaven, which goes back to ancient Germanic times, when the utterances of women in a trance were believed to be prophetic. Freud teaches us that dreams are messages from our subconscious ego, mostly suppressed desires. It may take another brilliant literary epoch to teach scientists and other mortals that dreams quite as often are messages from the realm of trivialities.

*The Religious Views of Gerhart Hauptmann as Reflected in his Works*, by Professor G. C. Cast, is a wonderfully clear and intelligent exposition of a difficult subject, illustrating well what Paul Schlenther said at the close of his Hauptmann biography: "Gerhart Hauptmann ist unser allerheidnischster, unser allerchristlichster Dichter."

Professor M. Blakemore Evans takes us into the seventeenth century and shows us that *The Attitude of Andreas Gryphius toward the Supernatural* differed as man and poet. The greatest German dramatist before Lessing, Gryphius made abundant use of ghosts and supernatural elements in the exercise of his stagecraft, but as an enlightened man of affairs he was skeptical in regard to witchcraft, magic and compacts with the devil, looking forward, we may say to the generation of Thomasius.

*Zum Problem von Goethes Clavigo* is an offshoot of Professor Ernst Feise's more comprehensive study *Goethes Werther als nervöser Charakter*, published in *The Germanic Review*, Vol. I, No. 3, also dedicated to Professor Hohlfeld. In both Professor Feise proves himself a very able advocate of the application of modern psychological and psycho-analytical theories to the interpretation of literature, specifically the Young Goethe and the *Sturm und Drang* period. It seems legitimate that literature and science should aid one another wherever possible, as heretofore literature and philology, history, philosophy, sociology.

While Professor G. F. Lussky's results are largely negative in *Die Frauen in der mittelhochdeutschen Spielmannsdichtung*, the truth will make us free in whatever direction it turns. In *Three Translations of Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris* Professor B. Q. Morgan places before our view the translation of the American, Judge Beverly Tucker (1844), and the two English women, Anna Swanwick (first version 1850, revised 1879), and Elizabeth Dowden (1906). Himself an adept in the art of translation, Professor

Morgan reviews all three critically both as to style and fidelity, and awards the prize to Mrs. Dowden.

Professor L. M. Price, authority on English-German literary interrelations, contributes an article on *Richardson in the Moral Weeklies of Germany*, which opens up large vistas over new material and advances our knowledge far beyond bibliographical information.

In the title of Professor E. Prokosch's article the reviewer would suggest the substitution of the word *Stimmung* for *Personlichkeit*, causing it to read: *Rhythmus und Stimmung in Goethes Faust*, for the intimate relation between these two, Rhythm and Feeling, is what is conclusively proved in this penetrating study. Professor Prokosch bases arguments on the relative frequency of various types of verses (carefully counting them), with very interesting results, some of which appear as a revelation. He has undoubtedly advanced us in our understanding of Goethe's artistic use of varied metres in the First and Second Parts of *Faust*.

Tim Kröger, *Heimatkunstler* in Schleswig Holstein dialect, has hardly come to his own in Germany, not to speak of America. We are therefore grateful to Professor C. M. Purin for bringing him out. In his article *Tolstoi und Kröger: Eine Darstellung ihrer literarischen Beziehungen*, Professor Purin also takes the opportunity to call attention to the unexploited field of the Russian influences upon modern German writers. It should not be forgotten, however, that currents ran both ways, even in the case of the modern period, and that the German influence upon Russian literature was profound in earlier times.

Professor E. C. Roedder, life-long student of Schiller, extracts a leaf from his Schiller portfolio to close the scholarly *Reigen*. After reviewing numerous undeveloped dramatic plans of the great poet, the *Blätter aus meiner Schillermappe* conclude with an analysis of a disputed point in the play of *Maria Stuart*. Professor Roedder holds the view that the Scottish queen did not give up hope immediately after the interview with Queen Elizabeth in the third act, that only succeeding events brought on the feeling of resignation in the fifth act. The suspended hope is a touch of Schiller's high art.

In conclusion the reviewer wishes to congratulate the editors, Professors Bruns, Morgan and Roedder, upon the skillful performance of their task. May they live to repeat their labors on the happy event of Professor Hohlfeld's seventieth birthday!

ALBERT B. FAUST.

Cornell University.

---

*Historia de la Literatura Española.* Por J. HURTADO y A. G. PALENCIA. Madrid: 1925. xvi + 1127 pags.

Este manual es hoy por hoy uno de los más completos y más claros que existen. Los autores, teniendo en cuenta las críticas que se hicieron de la primera edición, han mejorado notablemente esta segunda, rectificando fechas, corrigiendo los cuadros sinópticos, completando la bibliografía y refundiendo totalmente algunos párrafos según los más recientes estudios. Las adiciones son por lo general acertadas y tienden a aclarar ciertos puntos un tanto confusos en la versión primitiva.

Pero las mejoras llevadas a cabo no impiden hallar aún varios reparos. De la bibliografía podrían eliminarse algunos títulos que nada significan y añadir otros que se echan de menos. La misma falta de selección se nota en las listas cronológicas: sobran muchas fechas que no tienen nada que ver con la literatura. Respecto de los cuadros sinópticos hay que decir que ciertas subdivisiones parecen impropias de un texto serio.

Las biografías suelen pecar de largas. Pudieran abreviarse suprimiendo aquellos detalles que no tengan relación alguna con la obra del autor, así como las anécdotas que por amenas que sean se hallan fuera de lugar en un compendio, sobre todo si, como en el caso presente, están contadas en un estilo desprovisto de todo refinamiento. Aparte de muchos lugares comunes que nada dicen, se encuentran a menudo frases de una vulgaridad inexplicable.

Menos perdonable es la flojedad de ciertos juicios críticos. La interpretación de Góngora sigue siendo la de siempre. Primero advierten los autores que no hay dos épocas en su producción, pero luego hablan como todos del mal gusto de las *Soledades* y definen el gongorismo como un vicio literario. Tampoco al autor del *Criticón* se le trata debidamente, y eso que ya hace tiempo que se viene insistiendo sobre la necesidad de conceder a Gracián toda la atención que se merece.

Pero lo peor de todo es la parte moderna. Los autores del siglo pasado están muy medianamente juzgados. Falta de comprensión para algunos y exceso de entusiasmo por otros. El capítulo dedicado a la época actual no es más que una lista hecha con muy poco criterio. De la influencia de Rubén Darío apenas se habla, y la poesía española fué hasta hace poco casi exclusivamente rubeniana, hecho que tiene doble importancia por ser la primera vez que un escritor americano influye decisivamente sobre la literatura peninsular. A Unamuno se le despacha en media página, lo mismo que a Muñoz y Pabón, y se dice que "tiene varios ensayos buenos." Todo este capítulo, aunque ha merecido elogios, está lleno de errores que saltan a la vista.

Hay que confesar sin embargo que hasta ahora no se ha publicado en España manual de literatura mejor que éste, ni siquiera comparable, pues resume mejor que ningún otro todo cuanto antes se ha dicho de esencial sobre obras y autores, con claridad y discreción excepcionales, superando al Mérimée en exactitud y al Fitzmaurice-Kelly en amenidad.

JOSÉ ROBLES.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Life of Racine.* By MARY DUCLAUX (A. M. F. ROBINSON).  
New York: Harper and Bros., 1926. 256 pp. \$4.

Not only to the cultured public, for whom it is intended, but to specialists who still boast of not having a "tête racinienne" this book furnishes a most sympathetic introduction to the study of the dramatist. There is no doubt that the author deeply appreciates the work of Racine and that she is able to convey her enthusiasm to her reader even in the difficult matter of the verse translations scattered through her pages.<sup>1</sup> She has attempted, not a work of literary criticism, but the life of a literary figure. One must not expect to find a thorough-going treatment of the poet and dramatist, but a work that will attract the outsider to more intimate knowledge. It is a pity, however, that so much good taste should be so completely divorced from erudition. The work done by investigators in the last 50 years is largely ignored. This brings her to write (p. 209) in regard to a memorandum mentioned by Louis Racine: "There have been found modern critics to doubt its very existence; not, however, those who knew Racine best, neither Sainte-Beuve nor Jules Lemaitre." A great name is evidently for her a sufficient guarantee.

Again, she accepts without question the legend, successfully disposed of by M. Michaut,<sup>2</sup> that Henriette d'Angleterre suggested to Corneille and Racine a competition on the subject of Titus and Berenice. She blunders elsewhere with regard to the plays in question (p. 96), writing that when they appeared Corneille's "fell from the stage at once," while Racine's "held the boards for thirty consecutive representations, a number, until that date,

<sup>1</sup> There is unfortunately an occasional handling of what is simple in French in the grand manner. For instance, "après avoir pris de la mort-aux-rats" is translated by "having quaff'd a cup of rat-poison" (p. 126). Why not "having taken rough-on-rats"?

<sup>2</sup> *La Bérénice de Racine*, Paris, Société française d'impr. et de libr., 1907, pp. 99-137.

unknown in the annals of the theatre in France." The slightest habit of turning to original documents would have sent her to La Grange's *Registre*, where she would have learned that Corneille's *Bérénice* was played 21 times between Nov. 28, 1670, and March 8, 1671, by no means a bad showing, and that the fine record of Racine's play had been equalled by Molière's *Amphitryon* and surpassed by his *Fâcheux* and *Tartuffe*. Even when she makes use of a standard book like Mesnard's *Racine*, she fails to consult the last edition and consequently retains his identification of La Fontaine's Gélaste with Molière, which he changed in the edition of 1885 to Chapelle.

Out of touch with original documents and with the most recent critical opinion, she naturally falls a victim to the manufacturers of gossip who enlivened eighteenth century reading. Her book remains a delightful approach to the subject, but one that has to be supplemented by more exhaustive and critical research before it will satisfy the scholar.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

*Translations from Old English Poetry*, edited by ALBERT S. COOK and CHAUNCEY B. TINKER. Revised edition. Ginn and Co. Boston, 1926. \$1.48.

This well-known volume now appears in a new edition which differs but little from the edition of 1902. Indeed, the text itself is unaltered. Even the number of pages remains exactly the same, and the "Preface" has not been touched. The revision manifests itself in the notes introductory to the various selections, and in the bibliography given on pp. 172 f. The editors exhibit their broad-mindedness in including the *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise* of Legouis in their bibliography: the French *savant* does not like Old English poetry, which is too deeply Christian in spirit to suit his tastes, and his dislike comes out very strongly in his *Histoire*—indeed, he goes so far as to deny that *Beowulf* has any place at all in English literature. Messrs. Cook and Tinker evidently feel (and justly) that what they offer will speak for itself, and outweigh Mr. Legouis's sentence of expulsion! We welcome the new edition of this admirable little book, and hope and believe it will prove as useful as its predecessor.

KEMP MALONE.



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

DECEMBER, 1926

Number 8

---

## HISTORY AS COSTUME IN HEBBEL'S DRAMAS

Two distinct ideas run through the passages in which Hebbel defines the relation of drama to history.<sup>1</sup> The first is the idea of history, the second is that of the social basis of the drama. Hebbel rejects the notion of antiquarian interest in historical drama. The dramatist, he says, can give only himself and the vital ideas of his times as reflected in his mind. The choice of an historical subject is only a matter of convenience, and theoretically an invented story could serve just as well. In short what makes the drama "historical" is never in the subject-matter (*im Stoff*). Hebbel says in so many words that the value of a drama will be in its revealing the character of the poet and his contemporaries, rather than in showing how they conceived of their remote ancestors. "Die Geschichte ist für den Dichter ein Vehikel zur Verkörperung seiner Anschauungen und Ideen, nicht aber ist umgekehrt der Dichter der Auferstehungselengel der Geschichte" (XI, 9; XIII, 4, 32).

From this it appears that the significance of the drama as history lies in its representing the poet's own age and not that from which the subject-matter is taken. Support of this interpretation is found in the *Vorwort zu Maria Magdalena*, in the well-known passage where great drama is limited to epochal crises in the *Weltanschauung* of the race, and such crises are defined as three, represented respectively by the Greek, the Shakesperean, and the modern drama. The historical importance of Aeschylus and Shakespeare is that they embody their respective crises. So modern

<sup>1</sup> Important ones are, R. M. Werner edition, XI, 5, 9, 20, 22, 34, 35, 36-38, 40, 43, 57-61, 63; XIII, 4, 32.

drama, embodying the present great crisis, which the poet clearly defines, will have its highest historical value in the future.<sup>2</sup>

Assuming for a moment that this is the only interpretation to be put on the poet's words, it would mean that his dramas are fundamentally modern, even when, as is rarely the case, they do not employ a contemporary costume. We should accordingly describe his procedure as follows: In *Judith* and *Genoveva* he began to symbolize in historical or legendary costume; then, under the influence of *Das junge Deutschland*, he adopted contemporary costume in *Maria Magdalena* and *Julia*; and finally from a well-considered point of view he decided to employ again the more remote setting (*Herodes to Demetrius*). His whole preoccupation would be, as radical or conservative, with the problems of his own critical age, and the choice of costume solely a matter of form. We might compare him with Ibsen in this respect, who began with a remote symbolism, later to adopt the contemporary mask.

The case is, however, not quite so simple as this. Closer attention to the passages in question (especially XI, 5, 20, 22, 35, 36-37, 58-69) will show some statements that do not seem to fit this interpretation. In them Hebbel not only speaks of preserving the atmosphere of the times, which might mean keeping the unity of costume, he distinguishes the *materielle Hälfte der Geschichte* from the *geistige*, he mentions the necessity of using the decisive historical crises (XI, 5). Such passages indicate that in addition to catching the spirit of his own times he was concerned with catching the spirit of the age from which the costume was chosen. We also know that Hebbel, for example, supposed that his *Judith* symbolized the conflict between Jew and heathen, that in his *Agnes Bernauer* he had set up a monument to the old German state, and his other dramas are likewise said to represent some important historical crisis or transition.

The question naturally arises as to which of these two points of view the poet took more consistently in his dramas. For if both of them are to apply at once, a serious problem of form is involved. How can a drama really represent some past transitional crisis and also that present crisis of which the poet speaks at such length? Yet it seems that Hebbel in youthful exuberance

<sup>2</sup> R. M. Werner, XII, pp. xx and xxvii, lucidly summarizes this phase of Hebbel's theory.

actually set such a goal for himself. After characterizing contemporary drama as historical, social, or philosophical, he declared a union of the three to be his own objective. (See also R. M. Werner, XIII, p. xx). Disregarding the antiquarian drama, which the true poet would ordinarily rule out, we may assume that the maker of any historical drama will select some theme enabling him to reveal great conflict of character or emotions. In *Macbeth* or *Wallenstein* we see tremendous forces and passions at work, the human interest everywhere dominating, in the past as in the present. Or in *Faust* the poet has used the characters and costume of the sixteenth century to express the spirit of rebellion actuating his own youth. Ibsen, in his *Emperor and Galilean*, found a theme that had a particular relation to the nineteenth century: resistance in both cases to the sway of Christianity.

In none of these cases is the present interest unique or peculiar to the contemporary age. It is an interest of so broad an appeal that it might be a product of an earlier age as well. This does not hold true, however, of the interest referred to in the term "social" as Hebbel used it. The social interest he had in mind was that demanded by *Das junge Deutschland*. The phase of it that concerned Hebbel most was the relation of the sexes. That relation had become problematic and was to remain problematic throughout the drama of the nineteenth century. Hebbel's dramas were the first permanent embodiment in dramatic form of this issue, and it is the possibility of uniting this specific social problem with drama as history that concerns us here. For this is a problem peculiar to modern times, or if that is too risky an assertion, let us say it is not implicit in any of the material that the poet selected to make his dramas of.

If in theory therefore the poet thought he could create a drama which at once symbolized a significant epoch of history and the peculiar social issue of his own age, how do his dramas actually impress us? Did he succeed in fusing two such heterogeneous elements, or do his dramas really fall into two classes—one employing history merely as costume, the other representing the historical drama as ordinarily understood? It seems to me clear that the second of these alternatives is true. A brief review of the dramas will reveal these two groups. Those dramas in which the relation between man and woman is treated problematically, dis-

regarding of course the few in modern costume, are in the first group: They are *Judith*, *Herodes und Mariamne*, and *Gyges*. This problem also appears in *Genoveva*, though in a more general way, and it is not emphasized. The other plays, *Agnes Bernauer*, *Nibelungen*, *Demetrius*, are historical dramas of the regular kind.

In *Judith* Hebbel attempted to combine the historical setting with a nineteenth century problem. And the more he prided himself, justly enough, on his success in capturing the *Atmosphäre der Zeiten*, on the life and truth of his street scenes, the more incongruous does the figure of his heroine become. The very thing that made the Apocryphal Judith a monster in Hebbel's eyes was what made her an integral part of her real environment. The naive popular character of the story guarantees that. Hebbel's Judith would have been impossible in Bethulia. This immediately struck his critics, who said (Vischer most clearly) that the modern characters spoiled the historical setting. It would have been nearer the truth to say that the historical setting spoiled the modern characters, for it was the modern characters that gave the play its lasting value. This incongruity is most glaring in *Judith*. With increasing experience the poet softened though he could never quite overcome the contradictions inherent in his intentions. For in his own words he tells us that he symbolized in this drama a philosophical idea (individuation), an historical situation (Jewish-Heathen conflict) and a modern social problem (relation of the sexes). If we ask ourselves, however, which of these things lends the tragedy its unique interest, the answer is not difficult. The individuation theory is a pale abstraction. The Jewish-Heathen conflict is better represented in the old story than in Hebbel's drama. If Hebbel's *Judith* lives, it will live because it is the first important play in which the problematic relation of the sexes finds embodiment.

In *Genoveva* we find the same conflict between historical atmosphere and sophisticated characters. The misdirected passion of Golo is not specifically modern, though the extent of its analysis is. The modern aspects of the Genoveva-Siegfried relation are slightly emphasized. Mediaeval on the other hand is the bearing of Genoveva, who finds her solace in religion. If the predominant impression of *Judith* is modern, that of *Genoveva* is historical.

To Fr. Th. Vischer, commenting on *Maria Magdalena*, it seemed

that Hebbel had made a great advance in selecting a contemporary subject. He interpreted *Judith* as well as *Genoveva* as historical drama, and from that angle he deplored the incongruity between character and setting. Hebbel may or may not have understood this warning. At any rate, in spite of Vischer, he decided after *Julia* that he had better chances of doing permanent work in the remote costume. He instinctively recognized the advantages of such a costume. The age alone of a time-honored fable guarantees that the weak and temporary elements have been abraded. The tale is worn to a durable form. There must be something perennial in its parts and their relation. Such a form, if it can only be adapted to the problem in hand, is sufficiently abstract to avoid the danger threatening transient customs and particular versions, to which the contemporary costume is always exposed. Ibsen's *Doll's House* is a case in point. The special problem of this drama is cast in a form that already is somewhat obvious and commonplace. The persons are growing old-fashioned. Hebbel deals with the same problem in *Herodes und Mariamne*, but he handles it more philosophically, more abstractly, in short with more beauty. Or if we compare *Herodes und Mariamne* and *Gyges* with *Maria Magdalena*, we see that the poet was right and his critic wrong in the question of costume, for the last-named play is much more limited in appeal than the first two. It must be borne in mind, however, that Hebbel did not in these two tragedies accomplish what he set out to do, for they are not historical plays, but modern plays in which history is only costume. Neither could claim a very great interest, to say nothing of a unique interest, as interpreting an historical crisis, while from the point of view of the nineteenth century, to dispense with them would be to take from modern drama its first great representative and its most original poet.

The two tragedies, *Herodes und Mariamne* and *Gyges*, in which a specifically modern interest is abstractly expressed in historical costume, are especially instructive on their formal side. In the former play the poet has skilfully used the historical transition from an age of oriental despotism to one in which the conception of the value of the individual is at any rate foreshadowed, in order to form a symbol of the dramatic struggle of woman in our times to be treated as a person rather than as a possession. In *Gyges*,

on the other hand, there is no particular fitness between the legend and the modern idea, except as Hebbel has introduced it by a very clever assumption. The legendary material is sufficiently vague to justify his procedure, and from the same point of view his instinct led him aright in the use he made of the mystic aspects of the story, especially the magic ring. A legendary material, because of its indefiniteness in time and locality, is better adaptable to what the poet desires to say than a more clearly cut historical episode. A brief analysis reveals that Hebbel made good use of the possibilities of his material. The central idea of the drama is again, as in *Herodes und Mariamne*, the inviolability of a woman's personal rights. Hebbel also claimed for it the *Idee der Sitte*. These two ideas stand in the play in a noteworthy relation to each other. Kandaules is shown as despising the customs of his people, and violating the sacredness of his wife's personality. Not, however, in one and the same action, for in regard to Rhodope he transgressed no custom of his own country. Indeed Hebbel assures us (outside of the drama) that the only possible excuse for Kandaules' action is that it was in an age when women were looked upon as a possession. What therefore Kandaules would seem to violate is a personal and individual feeling of his wife. Yet it is more. For by the assumption of the poet the king in marrying Rhodope knew and accepted her customs, as far as she was concerned. Thus in his action toward her he also reveals his general attitude toward *Sitte* as well. By this clever stroke Hebbel fused his two ideas into one. The legendary material because of its vagueness is not hostile to such freedom of treatment. Again as in *Herodes und Mariamne*, Hebbel found an abstract and beautiful symbol for his message.

The three great dramas, *Agnes Bernauer*, *Nibelungen*, and *Demetrius* are historical dramas. There is in them almost nothing in form or content, that marks them as *specifically* modern in interest, which of course does not mean that they lack human interest. In the *Nibelungen* Hebbel said he wished to be merely an interpreter. The form in which the violated personality is here embodied is the same as in the old tale, and in that particular form (hate born of despised love) it is not characteristic of modern times. *Demetrius* is perhaps of all the plays of Hebbel the one

most conventionally historical, and probably points the direction the poet would have taken had he lived longer.

On the other hand a case might be made out for *Agnes Bernauer* as a symbolic drama. The poet has told us what he intended to symbolize: the representative authority of the state as greater than the greatest individual. The drama was Hebbel's reaction to the unbridled license, as he considered it to be, of the revolution of 1848. Two considerations would influence one to classify this work as historical rather than modern. First is its admittedly conservative tendency, which is at variance with the spirit of the drama of the nineteenth century, though it may have been a wiser and more philosophic tendency. The second and more important is that the poet does not succeed in subduing his material to conform to his meaning. That is, the rationalizing end is much less impressive than the magnificent Agnes-Albrecht love scenes, and in fact rather incongruous with them, in spite of all the cunning Hebbel has brought to bear on that part. It is correct and reasonable but chilling. Indeed the historical significance here does lie largely *im Stoff*, and Hebbel said the right thing about this drama when he declared it to be a monument to the old German state.

Hebbel assumed that he could write a type of drama in which both the past age and his own age could be adequately represented. There could be no more striking illustration of his rationalizing mental processes, from the consequences of which he was saved only by his still greater poetic genius. He was one of the most brilliant pedants that ever wrote. In no single work did he effect a union of the two elements mentioned. What he really did was to produce two kinds of drama: one prevaillingly historical in the conventional sense, the other essentially modern, in historical costume. It is the second group that gives him his title to fame as the originator of modern drama in the narrower sense of that term. In these dramas he dealt with the problematic relation between man and woman, which Ibsen then took up, and after him the whole series of modern dramatists, to illuminate it in their own peculiar fashion.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

*Wesleyan University.*

---

## THE TRANSLATIONS OF JOHN TIPTOFT

John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, has drawn to himself the attention of students of English life and letters as a brilliant and baleful figure, type and precursor of the work of the Renaissance in England. He was on one side of his life the fore-runner of Erasmus and Ascham, of Sidney and Milton, on the other of Thomas Cromwell and Strafford. We catch but glimpses of him, all striking and impressive: the brilliant master of ceremonies laying down the laws of a tournament; the coldly cruel judge, an engine of tyrannous revenge; the polished orator, moving the most critical audience in the world to tears with his beautiful Latin; the fosterer and student of ancient learning, enriching his own tongue with foreign treasure; the faithful Christian, calling on the headsman to prolong his agony by striking him to death with three blows in honor of the blessed Trinity.<sup>1</sup>

To the historian of literature it is a matter of importance to know the extent and character of his acquisitions, and still more to know the use to which he put them.

Four extant translations have been attributed to him by careful students, two on contemporary evidence and two by later conjecture. Caxton tells us (in a volume made up of translations of Cicero's *Cato Major De Senectute* and *Laelius De Amicitia*, and Buonaccorso's oration *De Honestate*) that Tiptoft translated the *Laelius* and the *De Honestate*. Leland inferred from various circumstances that the *Cato Major* also was by Tiptoft, and many (not the most cautious) writers since his day have followed his lead. In addition, a translation of passages from Caesar's *Gallie War* dealing with the invasion of Britain, printed about 1530, has been attributed to this first of English noblemen after Duke Humphrey to share the spirit of the Renaissance. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the evidence for Tiptoft's authorship in each case.

Caxton's testimony to the effect that Tiptoft translated the *Laelius* and Buonaccorso's oration need not be questioned. Caxton's

<sup>1</sup> The article on Tiptoft, *Dictionary of National Biography*, assembles the data excellently; Warkworth's *Chronicle*, Camden Society, Vol. 10, pp. 5, 9 (1839); Paston Letters, ed. James Gairdner, London, 1900.



. references to the earl are those of one who knew him personally and admired him warmly, and Caxton was an honest and careful man who had no motives for misrepresentation.

With regard to the *Cato Major* Caxton does not say who translated it, but declares that the translation was made from the French of Laurence de Premierfait, at the request of Sir John Fastolf. Perhaps because the translation from Buonaccorso had been made from a French version by de Premierfait, and since de Premierfait was known also to have translated the *Laelius*, it was inferred by Leland<sup>2</sup> that all three were from de Premierfait's French, and all three by Tiptoft. But the very fact that Caxton does not attribute the *Cato Major* to the earl is almost conclusive against the possibility that Tiptoft was the author. Caxton tells us, besides, that the translation was made at the request of Sir John Fastolf. Now, Sir John came back to England in 1440 and died in 1459, and was in some sort a patron of letters and learning during this period. During the last years of Fastolf Worcester was very busy in the public service. It was between 1459 and 1462 that he visited Italy and carried on his studies, and it was then or later that he could most easily have written his translations. Dates, accordingly, are against the likelihood that he wrote anything for Fastolf. Moreover, to ask for a translation or any other work of letters was the act of a patron; it would have been socially impossible for a plain soldier, a simple knight, like Sir John to have taken such a liberty with one of the foremost men of the kingdom.

Anstis<sup>3</sup> attributes the translation of *De Senectute* to William of Worcester. Blades suggests the possibility that Stephen Scrope, Fastolf's son-in-law, might have translated the Cicero as he earlier translated the *Dictes and Sayings* (Blades 191).

I do not know where Anstis' attribution is made; but though it is without direct evidence, it is much more than a random guess. Gairdner, in his edition of the Paston Letters, accepts it as a fact. William of Worcester was a "servant" of Fastolf, and he studied French in order to translate certain works for his patron. He complained at Fastolf's death that he had received no return for his devoted services.

<sup>2</sup> Blades, W., *The Life and Typography of William Caxton*, London, 1863; Vol. II, p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Blades, *op. cit.* Vol. II, p. 92.

He did make a translation of *De Senectute* which he offered to William of Waynflete without receiving any recognition. It is certainly not unlikely that he made his version at Fastolf's request, and that this book is his work.<sup>4</sup> The last name of William of Worcester and the title of John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, are the same, and the coincidence of having each Worcester the author of one of the translations from Cicero might easily have led Leland into confusion.

The attribution of the passages from Caesar is not rejected in such standard books of reference as the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and is accepted in Murray's *Dictionary*.<sup>5</sup> The fact that Tiptoft did not translate the Caesar may be proved by the simplest means. In the first place, all the Latin place-names appear with French equivalents. *Atrebatibus*, "them of Arras" (Bk. IV, cap. 21); *Equites Haedui*, "the knights of Autun" (v, 7); *Veneticum bellum*, "battellie of Vannes" (iv, 21). The presumption that the version is from the French is easily verified. Place side by side the Latin text the French of Robert Gaguin, and the English. *Milites*, vaillians cheualiers; valyant knightes (iv, 25) *navi longa*; vne longue nef, que nous disons maintenant vne gallee; a longe shyppe (whych we call a Gallie) (iv, 21). *In Morinos*; aux Moriens/ cest adire au pays de therouenne; to the Morinyens (now callyd the contre nere to therouen); (iv, 21). *Ultiorem portum*; laultre part; the other part (iv, 23). *Neque enim temere praeter mercatores adiit ad illos quisquam, neque iis ipsis quicquam praeter oram maritimam atque eas regiones, quae sunt contra Galliam notum est* (i. e., the merchants knew little of Britain); Et ceulz aussi de lisle de Bretagne ne congnoissent riens du demeurant de la terre fors les contrees marchissans a lamer et les aultres q̄ sont du coste de gaule (i. e., the Britons knew little of Gaul); And they also of y<sup>e</sup> Ile of Britayn had no knolege of no parte of the stedfaste londe/ but of the countres marchyng on the seesyde/ and the other placys of the coste of France (iv, 20).

Gaguin's version, being complete, must be the source of the selections. Now as to the date of the French version. It ends thus:

<sup>4</sup> Paston Letters, Introduction, p. lxxiv.

<sup>5</sup> S. v. *Devoir* (thus dating the word early).

Cy finist la translation des commentaire iulius cesar sur le faict de la conqueste du pays de gaule faicte et mise en françois et presentee au roy Charles huitieme de france par frere Robert gaguin docteur en decret, et general ministre de lordre des freres de saincte trinite et redemption de prisonniers christiens Lan Mil CCCC octante VIII."

Tiptoft was beheaded in 1470.

There are two known French printed editions, one of ca. 1500, the other of 1525; and the English translation was printed ca. 1530. It has not been possible for me to determine which French edition was used by the English translator; but there is no safe ground for dating the translation much earlier than the printing of it.

If the Caesar had been translated by Tiptoft, it would have stood as the almost solitary effort to provide an English version of any classical history before the sixteenth century, and would have entitled Tiptoft to recognition for a profundity of insight into the movements of thought in which he took part almost preternatural. For him to try his skill on Cicero's morals and rhetoric was not wonderful, but the idea of the importance of history, and especially of Caesar's history, had not made its appearance in England in his day. It is distinction enough for Tiptoft to be the first cultivated English nobleman of the Renaissance model, without putting him ahead of his age.

Moreover, the *Laelius* is not, as has been thought, from de Premierfait's French, but is direct from the Latin. Any page will show this fact. For example:

*Athenis unum accepimus*  
We have vnderstande  
*et eum quidem etiam Apollinis*  
One in Athenes/ And that he was  
*oraculo sapientissimum: hanc es-*  
so shewed and Iuged by the an-  
swere of Appole/ But thurgh  
*se in te sapientiam existimant,*  
such wisdom to be in you,  
that ye suppose/ hou ye haue  
*ut omnia tua in te posita esse*  
nothyng but such as is your  
plenare poware and therwith  
*ducas humanosque casus virtute*  
euery fortune happe or chaunge

Socrates qui selon le respon  
du saige dieu Appollo fut rep  
pute le tres saige de tous  
hommes lors viuant Maiz lelius  
par vertu et aussi par sapience  
surmonta les sept saiges de grece.  
Et si te dy Lelius que ceulx qui  
plus subtillement enquierent  
Ils extiment et croyent estre en  
toy si grande sapienceque tu  
peulx dire que tous les biens  
sont mis dedans toy mesme. Et

be subget to vertu, which caus-

*inferiores putes. Itaque ex me*  
eth Sevola here present. And me  
to praye you/ that

*quaerunt, credo ex hoc item Scae-*  
we may understande, how ye take  
the deth of Scipio Affrycan, and

*vola, quonam pacto mortem Africa-*  
moche the rather/ sith at our

*ni feras, eoque magis quod pro-*  
assemblee, this othir day in the  
gardyn of Decius Brutus/ so

*imis Nonis, cum in hortis D. Bru-*  
were we wonte to entrecomyne of  
dyuerse matiers concernyng our

*ti auguris commentandi cause, ut*  
weel publik/ ye were not

*assolet, venissemus, tu non affu-*  
present, where ye ne fayled in  
*isti, qui diligentissime semper*  
tymes past with all diligence  
*illum diem et illud munus solitus*  
there to accomplish your dutie  
*esses obire. (II. 7.)*

*Ho errore careo, quo amicorum*

I lak that errour/ that causeth

*decessu plerique angustiantur,*

othir to be of the vexyd whan  
their frendes decesse. (III, 10)

*Quod si exemeris ex natura rerum*

.And take away from nature the

si peux Iuger que tous cas de  
fortune soient moindres que nest  
ta vertu qui entre douce et  
amere fortune pareillement se  
maintient et ne tient conte de  
douleur ne de amertume. Pourtant  
doncques ces deux ycy Scevola en  
disant par quelle maniere tu le-  
lius endure et portes lamort de  
Scipion Affricain Et plus foit  
me Interroguent pour ce que en  
cestes nonnes prouchaines qui com-  
mencerent second jour de janui-  
er et fineront cinqyesme jour dudit  
moys quant nous venismes aux jar-  
dins de decius brutus noble cytoy-  
en Romain lors pour cause de par-  
lementer ensemble a faire elections  
de personnes pour auoir les digni-  
tes et nobles offices de Romme Et  
pour aduiser les future cas des  
choses affin que plus legierement  
on y pourueust ainsi comme nous  
auons de coustume tu lelius ne fus  
pas lors present et si as accoustume  
tres diligemment garder le jour des  
elections et de accomplir lofficie  
de annoncer qui en nos elections  
obtient la premiere voix.

Je ne suis point comprimé  
sous celle erreur et folie  
selon laquelle plusieurs  
hommes seules sont angoisseux  
et troubles pour la deuccurance et  
perte de leurs amis ou mors ou  
esloignés erroneement cuidoient  
que les âmes meurent avec les corps  
ce qui nest pas.

Et dentre les chose que dame  
nature fist tu ostoyes la con-  
iunctions et compaignie et be-  
neolence au monde ne pouvre

<i>benevolentiae conjunctionem, nec</i>	estre ferme aucune maison ne
	autre cite et la labouraige
ioyned good will of thynges, and	de la terre ne sera ia permanent
	ne durable.
<i>domus ulla nec urbs stare poterit,</i>	
neyther hows ne cytee, ne tylthe	
<i>ne agri quidem cultus permanebit.</i>	
of lond shall remayne. (VII, 23.)	

The two translations are not only independent, but are based on utterly distinct principles. De Premierfait's translation was made by a writer whose main idea of style was that no sentence was satisfactory without a triple series of balanced pairs of synonyms, for a royal prince with an amateur respect for letters but no discipline in attention. Every expression is amplified, every difficulty explained in parentheses. "Le livre de Vieillesse 'lequel dicta et escrivi le noble philosophe et prince de eloquence, Tulle, consul rommain, dedens la poitrine duquel philosophe naturelle et morale esleut son domicile,' est escrit 'en tres courtet latin,' " says de Premierfait, and hence he has expanded it "'en exposant par motz et par sentences' ce qui lui a semblé trop bref ou trop obscur." (Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature françaises*, Paris, 1896-99, vol. II, p. 267.)

Tiptoft's version, on the other hand, is painfully close to his Latin; it is at the same time full of errors, is cramped and rigid, and shows little command of a free English style. It is a student's exercise in which the original is treated with timid respect, though without perfect knowledge, and is written in a language not yet master of its own possibilities, not yet made capable of reproducing the rounded periods and the flowing copiousness of Cicero.

The translation of Accursius, on the other hand, is tolerably easy and fluent. These two translations, from the French and the Latin, are all that we have from Tiptoft's hand, besides a few letters and official papers. In the great work of creating English prose two influences, the Latin and the French, were to be dominant. It is not uninteresting to find in the work of this first of English men of letters among lords both influences, which were to be exerted mainly through translations for a century: the one leading to a clear though elaborate syntactical regularity, the other to a simpler evolution of the sentence, and to a pleasant facile ease.

DENHAM'S SUPPOSED AUTHORSHIP OF *DIRECTIONS  
TO A PAINTER*, 1667

These *Directions to a Painter* are of interest, not poetically, but historically. Being sharp satires on the conduct of the war with the Dutch, their value as historical documents is largely determined by a knowledge of their authorship, in order that the necessary allowances be made for prejudice, etc. They appeared under the name of Sir John Denham, but, as I hope to show, it is impossible that he should have written them.

Waller began the series of "Directions" by his poem, *Instructions to a Painter for the drawing of the posture and progress of His Maties forces at sea under command of his Highness Royal. Together with the battel and victory obtained over the Dutch, June 3, 1665*. This poem is a fulsome eulogy of the Duke of York.

Next came THE/ Second Advice/ TO A/ PAINTER,/ For Drawing the/ HISTORY/ Of our/ NAVALL Business;/ In Imitation of Mr. WALLER./ Being the last Work of Sir JOHN DENHAM./ Printed in the Year, 1667. This is a poem of 340 lines, beginning: "Nay Painter, if thou dar'st, design that fight". It satirizes the conduct of the Duke of York in the battle of Lowestoft, June 1665, which Waller had lauded, and the Earl of Sandwich's conduct before Bergen in August of the same year. It is possible that this is the poem referred to by Pepys, December 14, 1666 when he says: "And here I met with, sealed up, from Sir H. Cholmly, the lampoone, or the Mocke-Advice to a Painter, abusing the Duke of York and my Lord Sandwich, Pen, and the King himself, in all the matters of the navy and warr."

Next came THE/ Second, and Third Advice/ TO A/ PAINTER,/ For Drawing the/ HISTORY/ Of our/ NAVALL Actions,/ The two last Years, 1665 And 1666./ In Answer to Mr. WALLER./ (Motto)/ A. Breda, 1667. It consists of 1) a reprint of the Second Advice, "Nay Painter" etc., under the heading THE/ Second Advice/ TO A/ PAINTER,/ FOR/ Drawing the History of our/ NAVALL Bussiness;/ In Answer to Mr. WALLER., and 2) a poem of 428 lines, beginning: "Sandwich in Spain now, and the Duke in love", under the heading, THE/ Third Advice/ TO A/ PAINTER,/ On our last Summers Success,/ with *French and Dutch*./ 1666./ Written by

the same Hand as the former was. The subject of the *Third Advice* is the four day's battle of the Downs, June 1666.

Finally came DIRECTIONS/ TO A/ PAINTER/ FOR/ Describing our Naval Business:/ In Imitation of Mr. WALLER./ BEING/ The Last Works/ OF/ Sir JOHN DENHAM./ Whereunto is annexed,/ CLARINDONS House-Warming./ By an Unknown AUTHOR./ Printed in the Year 1667. This contains, 1) the *Second Advice*, "Nay Painter", 2) the *Third Advice*, "Sandwich in Spain now", and 3) two new sections: "Draw England ruined by what was giv'n before", which describes the ascent of the Thames by the Dutch, June 1667; and "Painter where wast thy former work did cease?", which treats of the events following the Treaty of Breda, July 31, 1667.

Considering the poems as a whole, we can find four arguments against Denham's authorship: (1) There has always been doubt of their authenticity. Wood says, ". . . to which directions, tho' Sir John Denham's name is set, yet they were thought by many to have been written by Andr. Marvell Esq." <sup>1</sup>; and in the reprint of the *Directions* in *Poems on Affairs of State, 1703*, Vol. I, we find this note in the table of contents: "Said to be written by Sir John Denham, but believed to be writ by Mr. Milton." <sup>2</sup> (2) The events described in some of the poems fall within the period of Denham's insanity. This will be treated in greater detail below. (3) Evidence of style points to the conclusion that the poems are not Denham's work. (4) It seems incredible that Denham, holding the official position of Surveyor-General (or architect royal) and being a favorite at Charles's court, should have openly published under his own name poems attacking state policies and high officials, and even the King himself. It would, however, be very natural for some one else to shelter himself under Denham's well-known name. Nor could Denham have written the poems without intending to have them get into print; such a proceeding would have been not only dangerous, but pointless, as the very *raison d'être* of such political satires is publicity.

Considering the poems separately in their chronological order, we come first to the *Second Advice*. Stylistically, this might,

<sup>1</sup> *Athenae Oxoniensis*, II, 424 (1721 edition).

<sup>2</sup> This may be a reproduction of Wood's statement with the blunder of Milton for Marvell. Not even an eighteenth century editor could imagine that Milton wrote them.

perhaps, be Denham's; there are but three feminine rhymes; there are no full stops within the line; the proportion of open to closed couplets is only about one to ten; and the lines have a tendency toward antithesis which is more pronounced than in the other poems. It is, however, like the others, full of elisions (see the second quotation below) which are entirely uncharacteristic of Denham.

The first part, dealing with the battle of Lowestoft, is evidently written with Waller's poem in mind, which gives point to the couplet occurring near the end:

Now may historians argue con and pro;  
Denham says thus, though always Waller so.

The appearance of Denham's name in the text might under other circumstances be considered evidence supporting his authorship, but here it seems merely put in as a blind.

Apart from style, there are two serious difficulties: (1) We do not know when Denham recovered from his fit of insanity. He was stricken in April 1666, and we hear no more of him until June 1667.<sup>3</sup> How long during this interval his attack lasted, and how severe it was is unknown. It is true that the events described took place in the summer of 1665, but I imagine that the poem was not written much before its publication, for the reason given above, that work of this character finds its way early into print. In any event, if this is the first of three editions dated 1667, it must have been published fairly early in that year, and we may well hesitate to assign a poem to Denham when the last we have heard of him is that he thinks himself the Holy Ghost.<sup>4</sup> (2) The poem continues, after the couplet quoted above, as follows:

And he good man, in his long sheet and staff,  
This pennance did for Cromwel's epitaph;  
And his next theam must be o' th' Duke's mistress,  
Advice to draw Madam l'Edificatress.

The Duke of York's mistress was Lady Denham; the "Lady Builder" could refer to no one else, and Pepys in 1665 and 1666 has frequent references to the affair. Although Denham was, per-

<sup>3</sup> *Wood's Life and Times* (Ed. Clark), II, 75; *Historical MS. Commission, Report 6*, p. 339; *Historical MS. Commission, Ormonde MS. New Series* (1904), III, 217; *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1667-8*, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 219.



haps, a complaisant husband, it seems impossible that he should thus refer to his wife's infidelity.

We come next to the *Second and Third Advice*. This is probably the poem referred to by Pepys, January 20, 1666/7: "He did lend me 'The Third Advice to a Painter,' a bitter satyre upon the service of the Duke of Albermarle last year." It consists of a reprint of the *Second Advice*, and in addition the *Third Advice*, beginning, "Sandwich in Spain now and the Duke in love." I do not consider this poem Denham's for the following reasons: (1) The proportion of open to closed couplets is almost double that of the *Second Advice*, being about two to ten. (2) The naval battle that the poem described took place in June 1666, only two months after the violent outbreak of his insanity, so that the objections to the *Second Advice* on this ground apply with still greater force here. (3) The phrase "the Duke in love" refers to the intrigue of the Duke of York with Lady Denham.

Lastly we come to the *Directions to a Painter*. This contains the *Second* and the *Third Advice*, and two other poems in addition, dealing with the events of the summer of 1667: "Draw England ruin'd by what was giv'n before," and "Painter, where wast thy former work did cease?". My reasons for rejecting these poems are two: (1) their attacks on the King; (2) their style. In the first poem, the proportion of feminine rhymes is higher than in the *Second Advice*, and the ratio of open to closed couplets is almost four to ten; in the second, the difference is even more marked; there are thirteen feminine rhymes, at least twenty full stops within the line, and the ratio of open to closed couplets is about three to four.

To sum up: *The Second Advice*, judged merely by its style, might possibly be by Denham, though it has its uncharacteristic points, but his authorship is made very doubtful by (1) the fact that he may have been insane when the poem was written or published, and (2) the reference to his wife's infidelity with the Duke of York. *The Third Advice* has not so strong a stylistic argument in its favor, and is open to a still greater degree to the two objections given above. *The Directions* have none of the characteristics of Denham's mature style, and openly attack the King. Moreover, the tone of the whole series is that of an irresponsible free-lance critic, rather than a courtier and a dependent of the King.

### THE PARDONER'S TALE: A MEDIAEVAL SERMON

Professor Kittredge analyzes the *Pardoner's Tale* as follows:

The whole tale, as it lies before us, is one of the Pardoner's sermons, consisting of text ("the love of money is the root of all evil"), brief introduction, illustrative anecdote (or *exemplum*), and application. The *exemplum* alone is narrative, and this is readily isolated.<sup>1</sup>

My present aim is not to isolate the *exemplum*, but to regard the entire tale as a unit, and to examine it as a typical specimen of mediæval preaching. The examination is now made easy by Professor Caplan's recent translation, with commentary, of a mediæval tract on preaching,<sup>2</sup> from which in order to establish our principles of criticism, I quote the following passages:

The theme is the beginning of the sermon. In regard to it there are many considerations; first, that it is taken from the Bible; that it has a clearly perceived meaning—not incongruous; that it is not too long nor too short; that it is expressed in terms well-suited to preaching—in all its verbs, participles, and so forth.

Again, the theme is the prelocution, made for the proof of the terms of preaching present in the theme, through authoritative passages of the Bible and learned men, and by bringing in the authorities of philosophy through some simile, moral point, proverb, or natural truth.

Likewise what is said in the theme and its division is called the theme, since the division of the theme is the very theme itself; for from the theme the divisions proceed as from a root. That is why the division is called the theme.

Note that there are four parts of a sermon: the theme, the protheme or prelocution, the division or distinction, the subdivision or subdistinction.<sup>3</sup>

As the theme, prelocution, division, and subdivision of the theme now stand, the sermon is not yet complete unless some principal part is amplified through other materials, to wit, through adduced authorities. Otherwise the sermon becomes too short and simple. Therefore certain methods should be used through which the whole sermon is to be expanded as conveniently as possible.

The amplification of sermons is to be accomplished in nine ways: first, through agreements of authorities; second, through discussion of words; third, through the properties of things; fourth, through a mani-

<sup>1</sup> *Chaucer and his Poetry*, p. 21, Cambridge, 1915.

<sup>2</sup> *A Late Mediaeval Tractate on Preaching*, translated and edited by Harry Caplan; pp. 61-90 in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans*, New York, 1925.

<sup>3</sup> P. 74.

\*fold exposition or a variety of senses; fifth, through similies and natural truths; sixth, through marking of the opposite, to wit, correction; seventh, through comparisons; eighth, through interpretation of a name; ninth, through multiplication of synonyms.<sup>4</sup>

It will be seen that there is no mention of the *exemplum*, an omission that Professor Caplan calls "an interesting divergence from a favorite practice of thirteenth-century preachers, even among the Dominicans." In respect to the use made of the *exemplum*, I should like to quote the words of Professor T. F. Crane:

The foundation in the thirteenth century of the two great orders of Dominicans and Franciscans, the former, *par excellence* the *ordo praedicatorum*, gave an enormous impulse to preaching, and quite changed its character. The monks of these orders obeyed literally the words of the Founder of Christianity, and went into all the world and preached the Word to every creature. The popular character of the audiences modified essentially the style of the preaching. It was necessary to interest, and even amuse, the common people, who, as we have incidentally shown, were becoming accustomed to an entertaining literature more and more secular, and who possessed moreover an innate love for tales. It is chiefly to this fondness for stories, and to the preachers' desire to gratify it, that we owe the great collections of which we are about to speak. In the composition of the mediaeval sermon, which had, moreover, a certain fixed form, the stories, or to give them the name they then bore, and which we shall use hereafter, *exempla*, were reserved for the end, when the attention of the audience began to diminish. The value of these *exempla* for awakening the attention and instructing the people is everywhere conceded.<sup>5</sup>

This passage is of value, because it shows the wide use and popularity of the *exemplum*, from the thirteenth century onwards, and points out the fact that the story came at the end of the sermon.

Professor Caplan's *Tractate* concludes with three methods of preaching, of which we need consider only the last, as that is the one employed by the Pardoner.

First, the preacher should pronounce his theme in Latin in a low voice, then introduce one prayer in the vulgar tongue. . . . Now he should resume his theme, using the vulgar tongue for expression. And after this he can draw or elicit one prelocution through similies, moralizations, proverbs, or natural truths, or sometimes even by adducing definite authorities. Another name for the prelocution is the protheme, because

---

<sup>4</sup> P. 76.

<sup>5</sup> *Mediaeval Sermon-Books and Stories*, by T. F. Crane, read before the American Philosophical Society, March 16, 1883, pp. 54-55.

it is expressed before the division of the theme and the main substance of the sermon. . . . When the prelocution has been premised, resume the theme and its division. . . . When all the members, main and subordinate, have been discussed, the preacher can make a practical recapitulation of his sermon, so that if they have neglected the beginning, the people may know on what the sermon and its conclusions are based. . . . This method is the more common one among modern preachers and is as useful to intelligent preachers as to hearers.\*

With the foregoing paragraphs in mind, we may now turn to our examination of the *Pardoner's Tale*, and see how faithfully it follows the principles therein set forth. The sermon begins in the approved manner, the Pardoner pronouncing in Latin his short theme taken from the Bible:

Therfor my theme is yet, and ever was—  
'Radix malorum est cupiditas.'

The prayer that should follow the theme is absent, but there follows the speaker's own account of his preaching, in the course of which he says:

Than telle I hem ensamples many oon  
Of olde stories, longe tyme agoon:  
For lewed peple loven tales olde;  
Swich thinges can they wel reporte and holde.

The theme having been pronounced, the Pardoner at once begins to tell his story, but his training in homiletics has not entirely been forgotten, and so he turns back to his prelocution in order to prove the terms of the theme. Thus it is that we have the short introductory discussion of drunkenness, gluttony, and swearing, as proof of the term *malorum*, and of *hasardrye*, or gambling, as proof of *cupiditas*. The prelocution is expanded in proper fashion, with the stories of Lot and his daughters, Herod and John the Baptist, from the Old and New Testaments, and with the authority of moral philosophy in a passage from Seneca. These three authorities prove the evil of drunkenness, while gluttony is proved with the story of Adam's fall by eating the apple, and with passages from St. Paul.

The evils are next proved "by marking the opposite," for the speaker adds:

But herkneth, lordings, o word, I yow preye,  
That alle the sovereyn actes, dar I seye,  
Of victories in th' Olde Testament,

---

\* Caplan, pp. 89-90.

Thurgh verray god, that is omnipotent,  
 Were doon in abstinence and in preyere;  
 Loketh the Bible, and ther ye may it lere.

Then follows the story of Attila, the conqueror, who died bleeding at the nose in drunkenness, and the command given to Lemuel.

The preacher now takes up *hasardrye*, and tells the stories of Stilbon, the wise ambassador, and the king of Parthes. These are both short *exempla*, rather than citations of authority. In proof of swearing, he cites passages from St. Matthew and Jeremiah, and the Third Commandment, as we now list it. Finishing thus his prelocution or protheme, which stands before the main substance of his sermon, he says:

But, sirs, now wol I telle forth my tale,

and again takes up the theme of which he has proved the terms. The *exemplum* comes, then, at the end of the sermon in the approved manner.

When the story of the three rioters is finished, and some perhaps have forgotten the beginning, or indeed have forgotten that they are listening to a sermon at all, the preacher (to adopt the words of the *Tractate*) "makes a practical recapitulation of his sermon, so that if they have neglected the beginning, the people may know on what the sermon and its conclusions are based":

O cursed sinne, ful of cursednesse!  
 O traytours homicyde, o wikkednesse!  
 O glotonye, luxurie, and hasardrye!  
 Thou blasphemour of Crist with vileinye  
 And othes grete, of usage and of pryde!  
 Allas! mankinde, how may it bityde,  
 That to thy Creatour which that thee wroghte,  
 And with his precious herte-blood thee boghte,  
 Thou art so fals and so unkinde, allas!

Having thus brought his sermon to a close, the Pardoner instantly drops the rôle of pious preacher, which he has assumed for the past half hour, and resumes the part of the rascal, offering for sale his worthless pardons. The foregoing study has not sought to prove the *Pardoner's Tale* a sermon—that has long been acknowledged; but it does seek to show the excellent structure of the tale as a whole, according to mediæval principles of preaching, and thus, perhaps, to evince Chaucer's knowledge of mediæval rhetoric.

## TWO POEMS BY HENRY REYNOLDS

Though Henry Reynolds owes his little niche in literary history to his *Mythomystes* and his friendship with Drayton, he wrote some poems which make a modest claim on their own account and show that their author was not altogether unworthy to sit in the chimney corner and exchange verses with his poet-friend. In 1628 Reynolds published *Torquato Tasso's Aminta Englisht. To this is added Ariadne's Complaint in imitation of Anguillara*. The *Mythomystes*, to which was appended the *Tale of Narcissus*, was entered, and presumably printed, in 1632. Since the author says that the *Narcissus* he "had diuerse yeares since put into English," and since Drayton's *Epistle*, which alludes to many winter evenings spent in reciting their verses to each other, appeared in 1627, it has been thought probable that the pieces were written before 1627.

Our interest here is with *Ariadne's Complaint* and the *Tale of Narcissus*.<sup>1</sup> The former piece consists of thirty-eight stanzas of *ottava rima*. Ariadne awakens to find herself deserted and wanders about the shore complaining. Bacchus, sailing from India, comes, sees, and conquers, with the aid of Venus. The goddess gives Ariadne her crown, which finds a lasting abode in the sky. While Reynolds ostensibly writes "in imitation of Anguillara," the piece is really a paraphrase, sometimes close, sometimes free, of Anguillara's version in his 'translation' of the *Metamorphoses*.

A specimen stanza might be quoted:

When haplesse Ariadne, with the day  
Opes her (yet drowzie) eyes; and first her head  
Turnes on that side, where shee supposed lay  
The treche'rous man that from her side is fled.  
Her louing hand first this, then th'other way  
She vaine extendes; in vaine about the bed  
Her legg, and arme mooues; whence a cold feare takes her,  
That startles eu'ry limbe, and broad awakes her.

---

<sup>1</sup> My quotations are from the first editions. The *Narcissus* was reprinted in 1905 by J. S. Starkey in *Eng. Studien*, xxxv, 260 ff., and separately in the Orinda Booklets (published by J. R. Tutin, Hull, 1906).

Quando Arianna misera fu sciolta  
 Dal sonno che lo spirto avea legato,  
 Nè del tutto ancor desta, il viso volta  
 Dove crede trovar l'amante ingrato;  
 Stende l'accesa man più d'una volta,  
 Poi cerca in vano ancor dall' altro lato:  
 In van per tutto i piè move e le braccia,  
 Talchè 'l timor del tutto il sonno scaccia.<sup>2</sup>

Such a story is not, of course, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (except a brief allusion, viii, 174-82), and Anguillara apparently elaborated it mainly from Ariadne's epistle in the *Heroides* (x), adding the episode of Bacchus from the *Fasti* (iii, 459-516) and perhaps the *Ars Amatoria* (i, 527 ff.). The luscious manner had long been established in Italian verse before Anguillara wrote, along with the special cult of the mythological poem. There is, therefore, no need to call in Ariosto to account for Anguillara's style, yet some touches seem to be borrowed from the episode of Olimpia in the *Orlando*, itself an imitation of Ovid's epistle.<sup>3</sup>

As regards the source of his *Tale of Narcissus* Reynolds merely alludes to the story "which Ovid hath smoothely sung, and I paraphrastically Englisht after my owne way, and for my owne pleasure." "My owne way" proves to be Anguillara's way, for this piece also is a more or less free paraphrase of the Italian version—the freedom consisting mainly in abridgement.<sup>4</sup> Reynolds' verse flows softly and smoothly in *ottava rima*:

Dentro un' ombrosa selva, a piè d'un monte,  
 Dove verdeggia allo scoperto un prato,  
 Sorge una chiara e cristallina fonte,  
 Che confina alla linea di quel lato;  
 Che quando equidistante all' Orizzonte  
 Dell' Orto e dell' Occaso è il Sole alzato,  
 L'ombrosa spalla del monte difende,  
 Che il più cocente Sol mai non l'offende.

<sup>2</sup> Anguillara's *Metamorfosi* (Milan, 1805), Bk. VIII, stanzas 105 ff., II, 219 ff. Anguillara's version appeared in 1561.

<sup>3</sup> One may note, for example, in the stanzas quoted above, the delicate suggestion of Ariadne's exploring the bed with her legs, which is a trifle homely in this context. (Cf. *Orlando Furioso*, c. x, st. 21). Ovid had a surer taste.

<sup>4</sup> Ovid, *Metam.* iii. 341-510; Anguillara, Bk. iii, st. 136-198 (i, 174 ff.); Reynolds, *Eng. Stud.*, xxxv, 262-273. Thus Ovid has 169 lines, Anguillara 504, Reynolds 448.

Quel chiaro fonte è sì purgato e mondo,  
 E l'acqua in modo è lucida e trasparente,  
 Che ciò, ch' egli ha nel suo più cupo fondo  
 Scoperto a gli occhi altrui di sopra appare.  
 Or mentre il Sol dà il maggior caldo al mondo  
 Nel punto, ch'è principio al declinare,  
 Amor menò costui per castigallo  
 A questo puro e liquido cristallo. (p. 181).

Within a shady groue (under a hill)  
 That opes into a meadow faire, and wide,  
 Whose ample face a thousand py'ed floures fill,  
 And many 'an odorous herbe, and plant beside,  
 Rizeth a fountaine fresh and coole; for still  
 The wood of one, and of the other side  
 The shady shoulders, of the hill defende it,  
 That the warme midday-sun cannot offende it.  
 The water of this well is euer cleare,  
 And of that wonderfull transparency,  
 That his deepe bottome seemes to rise, and neere  
 Offer itselſe to the behoulders eye.  
 The hot Sun burnes the ground, and eu'ry where  
 Shepherd and sheep to the coole shadowes fly;  
 When loue, (to 'auenge himselſe) to this Fount guideth  
 This louely buoy in whom no loue abideth.

(pp. 94-5 in ed. of 1632(?); *E. S.*, p. 267).

While the *Tale of Narcissus*, like the other piece, is not a colorless paraphrase, it is a paraphrase, and the fact—which, as regards the *Narcissus* at least I have not seen noted—takes a little from Reynolds' not very exalted reputation.

The *Tale of Narcissus* was appended to the *Mythomystes* avowedly as an illustration of the mystical theory of poetry set forth therein, and after the poem follow "Observations," which expound the geographical, physical, moral, and divine senses of the allegory in the thoroughly mediaeval manner of a seventeenth-century Platonist. The various meanings are as neatly catalogued as in the *Ovide Moralisé* and other monuments of the mania for allegorizing; indeed such a fable as that of Narcissus could hardly be allegorized in any but the traditional ways.<sup>5</sup> In the divine

<sup>5</sup> A good many interpretations of the story of Narcissus are conveniently assembled in W. E. Buckley's edition of the poems of Thomas Edwards (Roxburghe Club, 1882).

I might add that I have not observed in Reynolds' poems any obligations to the numerous earlier versions in English of the same themes.



sense, however, we have the "modern," with his appeal to Pythagoras, and "the most autentick *Iamblichus the Caldaean*," and "his other fellow-*Cabalists*,"—not to mention the host of mystical authorities cited in the *Mythomystes*.

J. N. DOUGLAS BUSH.

*Harvard University.*

---

#### WILHELM MEISTERS LEHRJAHRE AND IMMENSEE

The editing and re-editing of Theodor Storm's *Immensee* has reached the point in this country where a special monograph might well be prepared on the significance of this superfluous activity. The latest edition and, all told, the best, of Professor Zeydel motivates this note, the pivotal idea of which has been on the writer's mind for years: Virtually the whole of *Immensee* is contained in the first twelve chapters of the first book of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, that is, in the first 35 pages of the Erich Schmidt edition of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* the total of which runs to 527 pages. Did Storm know his Goethe? One might as well ask whether he had ever heard of the Mayor of Husum or the Prime Minister of Denmark or the King of Prussia. Do we intimate here that Storm was a conscious imitator? Not at all; but his is seemingly a case of one of the most conscientious imitations known to German literature.

Anyone who has ever read *Wilhelm Meister* carefully can hardly fail to be struck by the way the novel begins. With the possible exception of the remarks concerning the puppet plays, the action moves with a rapidity that is rather unlike Goethe. Then comes all of a sudden the thirteenth chapter with the introduction of Melina. That is hold-up No. 1. There is many another before the close of the novel. There are echoes too of *Immensee* all through *Wilhelm Meister*. Storm's *Zithermädchen* is merely Mignon, and the inability of Goethe's character to write well after he had put on his cuffs is merely an anticipation of Reinhard, though the latter somehow manages to manipulate his pen after adjusting his. But we are interested here in *Immensee* as it stands and in

the same number, approximately, of words in the beginning of *Wilhelm Meister*, for we are not contending that Storm did in 35 pages what Goethe did in twenty-times as much space. Nor are we asserting that in details, either of fact or spiritual situations, the same can be found. Quite the contrary. Storm shifts decidedly: In *Wilhelm Meister*, by way of unimportant illustration, one person prepares a Christmas package for two; in *Immensee* two persons prepare a Christmas package for one.

In the two works we have these pairs of characters: Wilhelm—Reinhard, Norberg—Erich, Marianne—Elisabeth, Die alte Barbara—Erichs Mutter. In some ways there is a world of difference. Norberg and Erich are poles removed from each other. Moreover, *Immensee* has no Werner, though that is the family name of Reinhard. But the contention is not being made that Storm was only a copyist, an abridger. External or technical changes were necessary, inevitable. Storms' frame-setting is one of these, but it is not of great significance.

As to individual similarities we note the following, taking our clue from *Wilhelm Meister* and assuming that everyone knows *Immensee*, by this time, by heart: The separation of the real lovers thus giving the man of means a chance; the brightly lighted Christmas tree; the overworking of the word *Freund*; *Der Brief*; the leaving of the real lovers together, Goethe giving them much more of a chance than Storm does; significance of *die erste Liebe*; *Unterhaltung*, theatre in one case, botany in another; how "she" appeared to "him" for the first impression, as an actress in one case, out in the woods as *Waldeskönigin* in another; the basement restaurant out of which the guests in both cases *heraustaumeln* after having drunk the champagne; the lateness of the gift: Wilhelm gives *die Alte* a louis d'or with instructions to buy something, Reinhard goes out late at night to make his own purchases; the poetry in both works of calling up the past and noting the difference between what *wir sind* and what *wir waren*; the motif of *Überraschung*; learning of poems and reciting them of an evening to the parents; father conceals his good intentions to the children, Goethe in a rather pedantic and biographic manner, Storm in a much lighter way, through the strawberry and dessert episode; parties of children; the sense of smell, puppets in *Wilhelm Meister*

and the package in the room in *Immensee*, both from cakes; dissatisfaction on the part of the girl with the story the boy tells; trying to get back the lost love of childhood days; increasing of the child vision with future prospects and determinations; arranging and looking through of private papers; inability of Werner to see why on earth Wilhelm takes an interest in these things, just as Erich cannot appreciate Reinhard's poems or his visit to the lily and the lake; beginning a thing and never finishing it; pictures of commercial progress and industrial prosperity; the meeting of the lovers on the steps; inability of the girl to decide which one it shall be and the help given by an older woman; and, finally, the determination on the part of the practical-minded Barbara that no charge of hers shall throw her life away on a man like Wilhelm, however attractive he may be, in view of the dubious profession he is entering upon when a man of means and business prospects is in the offing.

Analogies of this sort are to be found also beyond the first 35 pages of *Wilhelm Meister*; we think of the motif of the *Halstuch* in both works. It would require much incautious audacity, however, to attach cardinal importance to these similarities if they stood alone; if they were the only parallels available for an argument. But that is not the case: there is also the motif of absentee-love. Marianne tries to fancy what might happen if Norberg were to return during Wilhelm's absence. *Die Alte* says: *Wer wehrt dir, in den Armen des einen an den andern zu denken?* The answer is of course "no one." It is a theme of very great possibilities. Goethe exploited it with almost fatal perfection in *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*. Arthur Symonds has made abundant use of it, particularly in his *Amoris Victima*. In Norway Johann Bojer has made full and frequent use of it. And that is really one of the outstanding features of Storm's story. Reinhard read his poem:

*Was sonst in Ehren stünde,  
Nun ist es worden Sünde.*

That is, it was once quite right, even sacred, for Elisabeth to love Reinhard; now however she is Erich's wife, and her love for Reinhard, absentee-love, is a sin. After the reading of this poem, Reinhard went out and down to the lake. What happened to him

there, as recorded in the chapter entitled *Meine Mutter hat's gewollt*, is known.

At the thought of separation from Marianne, with Norberg or some one else still around, Goethe's Wilhelm had this dream:

Mir träumte, ich befände mich, entfernt von dir, in einer unbekannten Gegend; aber dein Bild schwebte mir vor; ich sah dich auf einem schönen Hügel, die Sonne beschien den ganzen Platz, wie reizend kamst du mir vor! Aber es währte nicht lange, so sah ich dein Bild hinuntergleiten, immer hinuntergleiten, ich streckte meine Arme nach dir aus, sie reichten nicht durch die Ferne. Immer sank dein Bild und näherte sich einem grossen See, der am Fusse des Hügels weit ausgebreitet lag, eher ein Sumpf als ein See. Auf einmal gab dir ein Mann die Hand, er schien dich hinauf-führen zu wollen, aber leitete dich seitwärts und schien dich nach sich zu ziehen. Ich rief, da ich dich nicht erreichen konnte, ich hoffte dich zu warnen. Wollte ich gehen, so schien der Boden mich festzuhalten; konnt' ich gehen, so hinderte mich das Wasser, und sogar mein Schreien erstickte in der beklemmten Brust.

This dream seems to justify the thesis laid down in the opening paragraph of this paper. Professor Zeydel has attempted to justify his edition of *Immensee* on textual grounds. Such differences in the original and the copy as he has assembled constitute material for a purely philological study; for still another edition of *Immensee* they are insufficient argument.

*Immensee*, however, has been overread in the American college not merely because it has been over-edited: it has also been over-praised, for the thin little tale goes back to an immeasurably greater work.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD.

West Virginia University.

### WILL KEMP AND THE *COMMEDIA DELL' ARTE*

In a recent study Professor O. J. Campbell calls attention to Shakespeare's indebtedness to the *commedia dell' arte* in *Love's Labor's Lost* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.<sup>1</sup> Although there

<sup>1</sup> Campbell, O. J., "*Love's Labor's Lost* Re-studied" and "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and Italian Comedy." *Studies in Shakespeare, Milton, and Donne*, University of Michigan Publications (New York, 1925).

is danger of seeing *commedia dell' arte* where only native English comedy exists, Professor Campbell's assertions seem sane and reasonable; he shows pertinently that the Lylian influence on the low comedy elements in Shakespeare's early plays has been over-emphasized, and that much of this clownery seems to come from Italian comedy. One piece of evidence that Professor Campbell neglects, however, in showing *commedia dell' arte* influence on Shakespeare is the fact that English actors, particularly clowns, probably learned much from Italian comedians who acted in England and whom they met abroad. My purpose here is to point out that Will Kemp, most famous of Shakespearean clowns, came under the influence of *commedia dell' arte* clowns and probably added *commedia dell' arte* tricks to his repertoire of native clownery.

Kemp is known to have been a traveller; he is believed to have been on the continent with Leicester's players in 1586;<sup>2</sup> there he would undoubtedly have come in contact with Italian players who haunted the courts of Europe at this time. In fact, many of the performances given by the English comedians in Germany strongly resemble *commedia dell' arte* performances and perhaps were influenced by the Italian players.<sup>3</sup> Certainly about 1600 Kemp not only visited Germany but also spent some time in Italy, particularly in Rome.<sup>4</sup>

Previous to 1590, Kemp's clownery seems to have already attracted the attention of Italian comedians, who recognized in him a master of the type of clown-play which they themselves had perfected, if we may trust a statement made by Nash (?) in a pamphlet, "An Almond for a Parrat" (1590). The author, who had

<sup>2</sup> Chambers, E. K., *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), II, 325.

<sup>3</sup> See introduction to Cohn, Albert, *Shakespeare in Germany* (London, 1865).

<sup>4</sup> D. N. B., xxx, 390 ff., cites an old ballad, "An excellent new Medley" (c. 1600) which refers to Kemp's return from Rome. Chambers, *op. cit.*, II, 326, quotes an extract from the diary of William Smith of Abingdon, in *Sloane MS.* 414, f. 56; "Sep. 2 (1601). Kemp, mimus quidam, qui peregrinationem quandam in Germaniam et Italiam instituerat, post multos errores, et infortunita sua, reversus: multa refert de Anthonio Sherley, equite aurato, quem Romae (legatum Persicum agentem) convenerat)." The reference to Kemp's trip "over the Alps" in the *Return from Parnassus* is well known.

met Italian *commedia dell' arte* players on his travels, says that one of the players, "amongst other talks,"

inquired of me if I knew any such Parabolano here as Signor Chiarlano Kempio. Very well (quoth I) . . . He hearing me say so, began to embrace me anew, and offered me all the courtesie he colde for his sake, saying that altho' he knew him not, yet for the report he had heard of his Plesance, he colde not but bee in love with his perfections being absent.<sup>5</sup>

Another significant piece of evidence that Kemp was versed in *commedia dell' arte* technique appears in *The Travailes of the three English Brothers* (1607), by John Day and others.<sup>6</sup> Here a player designated as Kemp acts with an Italian Harlequin<sup>7</sup> in a typical *commedia dell' arte* skit that has no organic relation to anything else in the play. The dialogue near the opening of this scene is worth noting:

Enter Seruant

Ser. Sir, heres an Italian Harlaken come to offer a play to your Lord-ship.

Sir Ant. We will willingly accept it. Heark, Kempe;  
Because I like thy iesture and thy mirth  
Let me request thee play a part with them.

Kemp. I am somewhat hard of study, and like your honor;  
but if they will inuent any extemporall merriment  
ile put out the small sacke of witte I ha' left,  
in venture with them.

Sir Ant. They shall not deny't: Signor Harlaken he is content:  
I pray thee question him—  
(Whisper.

Kemp. Now, Signor, how many are you in companie?

Harl. None but my wife and my selfe, sir. Etc.

Note that Kemp insists on acting extempore after the usual manner of *commedia dell' arte*, evidently Kemp's ordinary preference in acting.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Smith, Winifred, *The Commedia Dell' Arte* (New York, 1912), 171.

<sup>6</sup> Miss Smith failed to mention this striking example of a knowledge of *commedia dell' arte* by an English dramatist, though she does say of John Day, p. 179: "Day also had evidently seen some zanni act, for a page in *Ile of Gulls* (II, 3) says, 'I, like Harlakene in an Italian comedy, stand making faces at both their follies.'"

<sup>7</sup> Bullen, A. H. (ed.), *The Works of John Day* (London, 1881), II, 55-59; (the play has no act or scene division).

<sup>8</sup> Before Kemp, Tarlton had been famous for his extemporal acting, but

The characters which Kemp and Harlequin cast for their performance are the typical *commedia dell' arte* figures, the "olde Pantaloune," the faithless wife, the cuckold husband, the cuckold-ing servant, the "Magnifico that must take vp the matter betwixt me and my wife," etc. Throughout the dialogue, the dramatist makes Kemp seem as familiar with the characteristic rôles as Harlequin; certainly the English author of the scene was thoroughly familiar with *commedia dell' arte* performances, such as Kemp must have frequently seen and imitated. Whether Kemp actually played the rôle which bears his name in this play is uncertain, but evidently he was at least being presented in a characteristic pose.<sup>9</sup>

In an earlier play, *A Knacke to Knowe a Knave* (pr. 1594 but acted by Strange's men in 1592 and several times in 1593), Kemp appears in a comic scene that must have borne *commedia dell' arte* characteristics. Promise is given on the title page of "Kemps applauded Merrimentes of the men of Goteham, in receiuing the King into Goteham"; yet the text of the play devotes only a scant page and a half to the inane comments of the "mad men of Goteham" before the king.<sup>10</sup> Without doubt, the bulk of the clownery was omitted in the printed version, or left for the improvisation of Kemp and his clowns.

The two rôles in Shakespeare's plays which have been definitely assigned to Kemp are those of Peter in *Romeo and Juliet* and Dogberry in *Much Ado About Nothing*. Both parts have characteristics of the *commedia dell' arte*, in addition to the features typical of English clownery. It is not my contention that Kemp was a mere imitator of Italian clown parts, but that he was familiar with their methods and adapted the technique to his own use; certainly so astute an actor as he was undoubtedly would not have come in contact with this widely popular form of clownery without

Tarlton's extemporizing consisted mostly of retorts and comic word-play rather than extemporal acting in a definitely cast plot, such as Kemp and Harlequin discuss in this scene.

<sup>9</sup> The date of Kemp's retirement from the stage is obscure; he is mentioned as dead or retired in Dekker's *Gull's Hornbook* (1609), and as dead by Heywood's *Apology for Actors* (1608)—Chambers, *op. cit.*, II, 327. The scene in this play is likely a version of Kemp's usual method of acting.

<sup>10</sup> Sig. F. i verso ff.

appropriating its usable features; it is impossible that Kemp did not witness *commedia dell' arte* performances.

If we accept Chambers's tentative dating of *Love Labor's Lost* at 1594, *Romeo and Juliet* at 1594-5, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* at 1595, and *Much Ado About Nothing* at 1598, it is probable that Kemp acted the parts of Costard and Launce in addition to those of Peter and Dogberry. The tricks Launce plays with his shoes and clothes in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* are typical, we know, of Kemp's performances; they are also stock *commedia dell' arte* tricks.<sup>11</sup> Professor Campbell has shown strong *commedia dell' arte* characteristics in *Love's Labor's Lost* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Similar characteristics are apparent in the clown parts of Peter and Dogberry in *Romeo and Juliet* and in *Much Ado About Nothing*. My conjecture is that Shakespeare was taking advantage of the repertoire, improved "after the manner of Italy," of one of the best clowns of the Elizabethan period, one Will Kemp. To Kemp the technique of the *commedia dell' arte* presented a fruitful means of amplifying his talents as a clown.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

*University of North Carolina.*

#### WOLFRAM'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE CRESTIEN MSS.

In *MLN.*, April 1926, Professor A. C. L. Brown pointed out the absolute necessity of getting access to all MSS. of *Perceval*. The students of *Crestien* hitherto had to base their knowledge upon two printed MSS., "in spite of their being aware that other MSS. diverge somewhat widely." In the course of a study on Wolfram and Crestien (*JEGPh.*, Oct. 1925) I compared these two MSS. and found that they, too, diverge considerably, mostly in expression, less in contents. So far it has gone unnoticed that the Mons MS. stands closer to Wolfram's *Parzival* than MS. Paris 794.

<sup>11</sup> Act 2, Sc. 3. Cf. Creizenach, Wilhelm, *The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (London and Philadelphia, 1916), 302-303. In Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour*, iv, v, occurs the remark, "Would I had Kemp's shoes to throw after you."



The most striking case I find in the passage

W. 351, 26	al ir porten wârn vermûret
Potvin 6276	Bien furent les portes murées

which reads in Baist's version

4860	Bien furent les portes fermées
------	--------------------------------

Another striking parallel between Wolfram and Crestien:

W. 108, 12	sîn pris gap sô hôhen ruc,
P. 1610	N'ot chevalier de si haut pris,

disappears with Baist's text

396	N'ot chevalier de vostre pris.
-----	--------------------------------

Where *Gawain* conquers the *Magic Castle* Mons reads:

P. 9202	Et par les fenestres volèrent Quariel et sajaïtes argans, S'en férèrent plus de -V-cens Monsignor Gauwain en l'escu;
---------	---

cf. W. 568, 21	fünf hundert stableslingen mit listelîchen dingen zem swanke wârn bereite.
----------------	--

MS. Paris 794 omits the numeral and substitutes

7793	Si an ferirent ne sai quanz
------	-----------------------------

There exists a most peculiar parallel where *Gawain* passes the *Dangerous Ford*. I ascribe it to a misunderstanding of the French text by Wolfram. (On similar misunderstandings see Heinzel, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 1894 and Lichtenstein, *PBB.* xxii, 57.)

W. 602, 26	sîn sper dâ bî im swebete: daz begreif der wigant. er steic hîn ûf ane'z lant.
------------	--

P. 9890	Si se lance si que il saut Sor la rive qui moult fu haut;
---------	--

Baist's MS. reads:

8483	Si bien s'afiche que il saute Sor la rive qui molt fu haute.
------	---

In the case of two parallels pointed out by Bartsch, the Mons MS., to my mind, stands closer to Wolfram although it is not so obvious. In the passages

W. 340, 7	Gāwân dāhte swer verzaget sô daz er vliuhet ê man'n jaget
P. 4987	Por quel paor, por quel manace, Je fuirai, quant nus ne me cace.

the dependent constructions are very much alike. Baist reads differently:

3775	Por quel peor, por quel menace Je fuie e nus hom ne me chace.
------	--

A direct translation is likely in

W. 364, 24	dā mac niht arges ūz geschehen.
from P. 6644	Par foi, ce ne me doit pas nuire,
Baist reads 5228	Ce ne me doit grever ne nuire.

It is also interesting to compare the equivalents of Wolfram's names in the two French editions. Most of them, of course, are identical. For many years I considered a number of Bartsch's explanations of Wolfram's names as too far-fetched, but after an acquaintance with the German poet that extends over a quarter of a century, during which period of time the explanation of these names has not advanced nearer to solution, I am inclined to agree with Bartsch more readily.

*Jeschûte* W. 130, 2 may have originated from

P. 1864	El lit, toute seule, gisoit Une damoiseiële endormie,
B. 650	El lit tote sole gisoit Une dameisele andormie

*Schaut* W. 345, 14 finds his explanation in

P. 6218	B. 4803	Oil, sire, se dex me saut Ses pères ama moult Tiébaut
---------	---------	--

*Vergulaht* W. 410, 13 in

P. 7407	B. 5991	Li sires ki herbegié l'ot.
---------	---------	----------------------------

Less convincing to me are the etymologies of *Scherules* (Bartsch II, p. 27); *Schanpfanzun* (II, 72); *Antikonie* (II, 75). This last name is explained by Singer, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 1916.

In four cases I find that Bartsch's etymology can only be based on Potvin's text, whereas Baist's text reads differently.

W. 152, 23	der verswigene Antanor, der durch swîgen dūhte ein tor,
------------	--

according to Bartsch (II, 163) goes back to

P. 2246                      En son retor trova -I-sot,

The name could not be developed from

B. 1032                      An sa voie trova un sot

W. 190, 9                    Dô sprach ir vetere Kÿôt

is obtained by Bartsch from

P. 3103                      C'uns miens oncles qui est pious

whereas Baist reads

1887                        . . . oncles molt glorieus

It sounds reasonable that

W. 277, 4                    Jofreit, fiz Idæl,

originated from

P. 6099                      Giffès, li fius Do,

Baist reads 4683            Giuflez li filz Nut

W. 348, 16                   li schachteliur de Bêaveys

may be P. 6206 *Teudavès* (Bartsch II, 13) but hardly Baist's 4790 *Traez d'Anez*.

I realize that it would be a hopeless task to try to establish the family of the French MS. used by Wolfram, as long as all the French MSS. have not been made available in print, but these remarks may point the way to further investigations, as suggested by the late Professor Foerster, in his *Kristianwörterbuch*, p. 202, Anm.

EDMUND K. HELLER.

*University of California.*

## TITUS AND VESPASIAN

Mr. E. K. Chambers is not the first scholar,—not even the first good one—to state with confidence that the *Titus and Vespasia* of Henslowe's Diary<sup>1</sup> was a source for *Titus Andronicus*, but he is,

<sup>1</sup> Henslowe's Diary, ed. W. W. Gregg, 1904, pp. 14-16.

"In the name of God, Amen, 1591. Beginge the 19 of febreary, my

perhaps, the most recent one to make the assumption and to state further, as if proved, that this *Titus and Vespacia* was actually the original form of *Titus Andronicus*.<sup>2</sup> His statement is as follows:<sup>3</sup> “. . . Strange’s may have handed over *Titus Andronicus* in its earlier form of *Titus and Vespasian* to Pembroke’s for the travels of 1593 . . .,” and one supposes, though it is not so stated, that he has in mind, as a proof, such work as that of Mr. Harold de W. Fuller<sup>4</sup> and Professor George P. Baker,<sup>5</sup>—for the earlier advertisements of this hypothesis were not accompanied by any attempt at proof. Clearly, this is an important peg, for on it hangs not only a source problem of really great interest,—considering the nature of the play—but also many less tidy rags of evidence for connecting the play of *Titus Andronicus* and its author with the company of the Lord Strange which was acting in Henslowe’s theatre during these years, 1591-1593; but when one begins to look for proof of this assumption, one is astonished

Lord Stranges meme, a ffolloweth.” . . . and there follows an entry for “tittus and vespacia” which he marks *ne* on April 11. 1591 and for which, on this first performance, he received *iiij s*. Nine days later it was given again, and this time he received *lvj s*, showing that it had been successfully advertised by the first pleased audience. In the spring of 1592 it was played again 5 times, always with good returns. Scholars seem to agree that the same play is referred to in a series of entries for 1593, though here it is called simply “tittus” (spelled variously) and the name of the company acting the play is not given. The reason for thinking that this entry refers to *Titus and Vespasian* and not to *Titus Andronicus* is that in the same year and the same month a play called “titus and ondronicus” is entered as *ne*, and this play was given by the Earl of Sussex’s men. Like the first Titus play, its financial history began with a humble *viiij s* for the first performance, but within five days, when a second was given, Henslowe records a return of *xxxxx s*.

<sup>2</sup> The suggestion may have come originally from Albert Cohn in his *Shakespeare in Germany*.

<sup>3</sup> E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, vol. II, p. 129. Mr. Chambers also alludes to this problem in a more recent article for *The Library*, March, 1925. Thus,—“*Titus Andronicus* seems to have been played in some form by Sussex’s men in Jan. 1594, if not also by Strange’s men in April, 1592.”

<sup>4</sup> Harold de W. Fuller, *Sources of Titus Andronicus*, *P. M. L. A.*, 1901, pp. 1-65.

<sup>5</sup> George P. Baker, “*Titus and Vespasia*” and “*Titus and ondronicus*” in Henslowe’s Diary. *P. M. L. A.*, 1901, pp. 66-76.

to find that it doesn't exist. One is even tempted to declare in haste that there is not so much as a shred of evidence for it, but there one would be wrong. There *is* a shred, just one,—or perhaps one should say that it is merely a stray cobweb, and no shred at all. The facts are very simple,—at least as far as *Titus and Vespasian* is concerned. The actual play mentioned by Henslowe as acted in his theatre by the Strange's Company, is lost; so there is neither help, nor hindrance to any hypothesis from that source; but the story of Titus and Vespasian is known,—or could be—to any amateur of medieval literature. As Mr. J. A. Herbert points out in his edition of the fifteenth century poem on the subject,<sup>a</sup> it was extremely popular, both because of its connection with the Gospel story, and because the subject matter lent itself easily to the legendary accumulations and gory elaborations so dear to the medieval story-maker. The summary of the story given here is quoted from the introduction to Mr. Herbert's edition of the poem.

The poem which is printed here for the first time begins with the introductory passage treating of the ministry, passion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the subsequent events, actual or legendary, in Jerusalem. It then proceeds to tell how Nathan was sent by Pilate to deprecate the Emperor's wrath; how a contrary wind took him instead to Bordeaux in Gascony, where Vespasian was then King under the Emperor Nero; how his report of the miracles of Christ led to the mission of Vespasian's steward Velosian to Jerusalem, from whence he returned with Veronica; how Vespasian was cured of leprosy, and of a plague of wasps in his nose, by gazing on Veronica's miraculous portrait of the Saviour; and how in gratitude he vowed revenge on the murderers of Christ. The second half of the poem narrates the fulfilment of this vow by the seven years' siege and capture of Jerusalem, and by the merciless treatment dealt out to its defenders.

Titus, the son of Vespasian, figures largely in this second part as the leader during this long siege.

It will be clear that the story of *Titus and Vespasian* has nothing whatsoever in common with *Titus Andronicus* except the name *Titus* occurring in both titles, but that it offered a very likely subject for a play of the early nineties, since it abounded in matter of cruelty and slaughter such as that which went to make up the machinery of the tragedy-of-blood type so popular as this very date.

<sup>a</sup> J. A. Herbert, ed. of *Titus & Vespasian, or the Destruction of Jerusalem* (in rhymed couplets) printed for the Roxburghe Club, 1905.

But the shred is a little stronger than the coincidence of the names of Titus in the two plays, though even this has been considered by some as a reason for connecting them. It is well known that companies of English actors went over to Germany from time to time, and there acted, partly in English and partly in German, many very miserable adaptations of current English plays. Among many such garbled versions which have come down to us, there is one particularly outrageous perpetration purporting to be *Titus Andronicus*. It is entitled "Eine sehr klägliche *Tragoedia* von *Tito Andronico* and der hoffertigen Kayserin, darinnen denckwürdige *actiones* zubefinden," and is dated 1620. The tastelessness, the vulgarity, and lack of any guiding hand at all seem sufficient proof that these plays were the productions of inferior actors. Sometimes it would seem, as in the case of *Hamlet*, that they worked from some kind of MS.; at other times that the productions were mere pot-pies of someone's bad memory and worse imagination. This,—to judge from Mr. Fuller's statement<sup>8</sup> that not one single line of *Titus Andronicus* as we now know it appears in the German *Titus Andronicus*—would seem to have been the case with the continental version of this play. It is not any particular wonder that such men should have made the simple mistake of thinking that if,—as they recalled in a popular play that they had seen at the Rose—the important male relative of Titus in that play was Vespasian, why would not the name of Vespasian do for the son of Titus Andronicus, particularly if they couldn't remember the correct name? Accordingly, the name of Vespasian has gone down in the *Dramatis Personae* of the German version of *Titus Andronicus*,<sup>9</sup> but this is all there is to connect the plays of

<sup>7</sup> For bibliography of these Continental plays, see Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, vp, II, pp. 270-271.

<sup>8</sup> Fuller, *Sources of Titus Andronicus*.

<sup>9</sup> A glance at the following *Dramatis Personae* from the German version will show that they didn't remember *any* of the names except Titus Andronicus.

The Roman Emperor.

Consort of Andronica.

Victoriades, a brother to Titus.

Titus Andronicus.

Vespasian, Son to Titus.

Heliates and Saphonus, sons to Ætiopissa.

*Titus Andronicus* and *Titus Vespasian*, and it, obviously, is no connection at all.<sup>10</sup>

*Bryn Mawr College.*

ELEANOR GRACE CLARK.

## QUEEN ELIZABETH AND BENEDICK'S "PARTRIDGE WING."

In the second act of *Much Ado About Nothing* Beatrice jokingly comments upon Benedick's manly appetite—his hunger for good red meat. My purpose here is to note that thereby Beatrice comes delightfully close to echoing a pleasantry directed by no less a personage than Queen Elizabeth against the great Lord Leicester. Elizabeth's little joke is recounted in Mr. Frederick Chamberlin's fascinating new volume, *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth* (1923 pp. 35-37).

Beatrice must be heard first. It is the masque scene, and Benedick has refused to admit that he is the Benedick who has dubbed Beatrice 'My Lady Disdain.' This Benedick, she tells her masqued cavalier, is the prince's jester—a very dull fool! She wishes that she might have been able to tell him as much to his face. The masqued cavalier somewhat ruefully offers to convey the message (to himself), and this offer Beatrice gaily accepts. And thereby hangs the joke anent Benedick's appetite. "Do, do," she says,—

"He'll but break a comparison or two on me: which, peradventure not marked or not laughed at, strikes him into melancholy; and then there's a partridge wing saved, for the fool will eat no supper that night."

Morian, a Moor, beloved by Ætiopissa.

Messenger, while guards.

Ætiopissa, Queen of Ethiopia.

Andronica, daughter to Titus.

Midwife, and a black child.

<sup>10</sup> I attempted to make a short summary of the action of the German *Titus* to make it as clear as possible that there was absolutely no connection in subject matter between this play and *Titus and Vespasian*, but the episodes were so disconnected and contradictory that the task seemed hopeless for a small space; I therefore refer the reader to the full summary of the play by acts placed in parallel columns with the Dutch and English versions in the article by Fuller.

<sup>1</sup> *Much Ado*, II, 1, 151-155.

Queen Elizabeth's winged word to the same purpose appears in a letter<sup>2</sup> addressed by her to the Countess of Shrewsbury, who had entertained Leicester "when he went to the baths of Buxton for treatment for the gout." It is, says Chamberlin, one of the best extant specimens of Elizabeth's "lighter style," and he adds that to get its full flavor one must bear in mind the fact that Leicester was "an extremely hearty eater and drinker."

The Queen begins by thanking her right trusty cousin, the Countess, for her entertainment of Leicester,—especially for the liberal "diet" which had been provided for him. She considers that this good service has been done not "unto him, but to our own self," and she therefore means "to take upon us the debt and to acknowledge you . . . our creditors, so as you can be content to accept us for debtor." But this might grow to be a dangerous debt if the Countess indulged Leicester too much! Therefore she must "cut off some part of the large allowance, of diet you give him, lest otherwise the debt thereby may grow to be so great as we shall not be able to discharge the same, and so become bankrupt." For the saving of her credit, therefore, the Queen prescribes "a proportion of diet which we mean in no case you shall exceed, and that is to allow him by the day for his meat two ounces of flesh . . . and for his drink the twentieth part of a pint of wine to comfort his stomach, and as much of St. Anne's sacred water as he listeth to drink. On festival days, as is meet for a man of his quality, we can be content you shall enlarge his diet *by allowing unto him for his dinner the shoulder of a wren*,<sup>3</sup> and for his supper a leg of the same, besides his ordinary ounces."

It is a bit anti-climactic to turn, after this, to the commentators' meditations upon Benedick's partridge wing. Indeed, a glance at the Variorum<sup>4</sup> suggests that good Queen Bess's shoulder of a wren would have been a choice morsel for the commentators, and that (not to crack the wind of the poor phrase!) it might have helped to clear the air.

In the first place, Elizabeth's joke would seem to indicate that Halliwell's contribution to the subject is not especially in point.

<sup>2</sup> Chamberlin gives no date.

<sup>3</sup> My italics.

<sup>4</sup> Furness, *Much Ado*, p. 74.



That "the wing seems to have been formerly considered the most delicate part of the bird" is a conclusion which nobody would wish to deny; but it is surely not a matter of consequence here. Deighton saw this, and came nearer to putting the thing to rights. "The jest," he says, "turns not upon the saving of the best part of the bird, but upon the effeminacy of Benedick's appetite, for whose supper such a trifle was sufficient." If Deighton had put it the other way about, he might have avoided trouble, for it would seem that other commentators took him seriously, or literally. The jest turns, of course, upon the *hugeness* of Benedick's appetite. For, as Wright observed, Beatrice had previously described Benedick as "a very valiant trencher-man," one who "hath an excellent stomach,"<sup>5</sup> and such an one would not have been likely to make a supper off a partridge wing! Wright's idea, then, would seem to be that in eating a partridge wing "Benedick . . . would eat what he would call no supper." Furness, who has the last word, may have been troubled by the apparent suggestion that this would have been a case of eating the wing and saving it too! "Nevertheless," he writes, "I am inclined to doubt that there is any hidden meaning in the words." Then follows a sentence in which Furness seems almost to have foreseen that Beatrice's mind and Queen Elizabeth's ran along the same line. "The jest," he says, "would have been equally pungent had Beatrice specified any other delicacy." But the point is not as Furness finally puts it, "that Benedick's appetite would be utterly gone." It is this:—Benedick, like Leicester, had so robustious an appetite that his abstemious lady laughingly suggests an allowance of diet such as Oberon might have fancied, but not Benedick or Leicester. When Benedick grows melancholy because no one will laugh at the jokes he has cracked about Beatrice—why then the valiant trencher-man won't eat his supper, and thereby, forsooth, a whole partridge wing will have been saved! And poor Benedick, unlike Leicester, would have had not even the twentieth part of a pint of wine nor yet a swallow of St. Anne's sacred water to comfort his stomach!

ALWIN THALER.

*University of Tennessee.*

---

<sup>5</sup> I, I, 51-52.

THE HOME OF THE *LUDUS COVENTRIAE*

In support of his contention that the Hegge Plays (*Ludus Coventriae*), or part of them, had a home or period of residence at Lincoln, Professor Hardin Craig adduces as his chief evidence two allusions to stage properties: "a fyrmament with a fiery clowde and a duble clowde,"<sup>1</sup> which may very plausibly have been employed in the Hegge Assumption play; and, secondly, the notice that every Lincoln alderman is to make a gown for the kings in the pageant on St. Anne's Day."<sup>2</sup> Of the latter item Professor Craig notes: "This has been supposed to refer to the Three Kings of Cologne in the Magi play; but there were only three of the magi, and there must have been more than three aldermen. The Hegge Prophet play calls for no less than thirteen kings, and is, moreover, unique among prophet plays."<sup>3</sup>

I venture here to propose a third item which may apply with equal precision to the Hegge Plays, in support of the Lincoln hypothesis: from the Treasurer's Inventory of 1536, in the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Mary:<sup>4</sup>

Item a Rede coope called the Rutte of Jesse of Rede velvett browdered wt Imagies of gold sett wt roses of perles wt a presyouse orfrey. havynge a morse of clothe of gold wt vj stones wantyng other vj havynge a hede sett yn gold the wyche hede hath now one stoñ.

The importance of a reference to this garment is manifest only when we recall that in the unique Hegge Prophet play there is a definite characterization of the "Root of Jesse." Unlike the corresponding plays of the other extant cycles, this play is a fusion of the Continental *Radix Jesse* play with the conventional English *Prophetæ*. In his study of this particular play Mr. J. K. Bonnell notes:<sup>5</sup> "The seventh play in the Hegge collection of English

<sup>1</sup> From *Hist. MSS. Commission, 14th Report*, App., Part VIII, p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29. Craig's discussions appear in the *Athenaeum*, Aug. 16, 1913, and in a note appended to Miss Swenson's *Inquiry into the Composition and Structure of Ludus Coventriae* (Univ. of Minnesota Studies, No. 1).

<sup>3</sup> Note to Swenson article, p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> *Archaeologia*, LIII (1892), p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Source in Art of the . . . Prophets' Play*: P. M. L. A. 29 (1914), 327 ff.

mystery plays is unique . . . Whatever its superficial likeness to the liturgical *Processus Prophetarum*, and other prophet plays, it is my conviction that this single English play is directly influenced by—indeed, largely derived from—that pictorial representation of the genealogy of Christ which is known in art as the *Tree of Jesse*, *Stirps Jesse*, or *Radix Jesse*.” After a discussion of the liturgical basis of the device, and its place in art, he continues: “There seems to be no ascertainable source for the play as a play of the *Tree*, or *Root*, of *Jesse*, save in art. . . .”

Here, then, in the Hegge cycle is a unique type of play, and the creation of a new rôle—that of *Radix Jesse*, the “protagonist” of what is ordinarily called the Prophet play, or *Processus Prophetarum*<sup>6</sup> (in the Hegge Plays the title of “Prophet Play” does not appear, as it does in nearly all of the other English mysteries). Following the *processus* and speeches of the Prophets and Kings, the play ends with the single stage direction, “*Explicit Jesse*,” and there is appended a genealogical table.<sup>7</sup>

If only by reason of its singularity this mention of an elaborate *Radix Jesse* vestment merits addition to the list of pertinent stage properties already found which argue favorably in support of the Lincoln hypothesis of the home of the Hegge Plays.

HERBERT HARTMAN.

Yale University.

#### A NEGLECTED EXAMPLE OF THE IN MEMORIAM STANZA

In a brief article called “Poems in the Stanza of *In Memoriam*,” published in *Modern Language Notes*, xxiv (1909), 67-70, Edward Payson Morton gives a list of 25 poems in the metre by 17 different poets—all before the publication of *In Memoriam*. For the seventeenth century no instance is cited between a translation of Horace, *Odes*, I, xxii, by John Smith in 1649 and a poem of three stanzas by Philip Ayres in 1687. As a matter of fact, a rather

<sup>6</sup> For recent research and discussion of this play see Karl Young: *Ordo Prophetarum* (Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy, Vol. xx).

<sup>7</sup> *Ludus Coventriae*, Block ed. (E. E. T. S., 1922), p. 62.

striking example of the form occurs in "Poems by the Matchless Orinda" (Mrs. Katherine Philips), first published in 1667. Professor Saintsbury in his treatment of Mrs. Philips' versification in his *History of English Prosody*, Vol. II (1908), pp. 394, 395, ignores this poem; his great interest in the *In Memoriam* metre (cf. *Ibid.*, III, 203-206) makes inevitable the assumption that he had not discovered it. The poem is a "Translation of Thomas à Kempis into verse, out of Mons. Corneille's lib. 3. cap. 2. Englished," and may be found in the edition of 1678, pp. 197, 198. The following stanzas exhibit a marked resemblance to *In Memoriam* in thought, cadence, and style—even to the imperfect rhymes:

Those beams proceed from thee alone,  
Which through their words on us do flow;  
Thou without them canst all bestow,  
But they without thee can give none.

They may repeat the sound of words,  
But not confer their hidden force,  
And without thee their best discourse  
Nothing but scorn to men affords.

Let them thy Miracles impart,  
And vigorously thy will declare;  
Their voice, perhaps, may strike the Ear,  
But it can never move the heart.

All the stanzas are not so good; several contain decasyllabic lines, which imply that the writer was not entirely aware of what she was trying to do. The extraordinary fact, however, about this overlooked poem is that it reveals again in especially convincing manner the peculiar suitability of the stanza, not for "pensive meditation," as Professor Saintsbury says (III, 205), but for what might be called poetic theology.

IRENE P. MCKEEHAN.

*University of Colorado.*

---

## L'ALLEGRO 45-48

The various errors in the interpretation of this passage arise from the presupposition that the good-morrow salutation must be addressed to human ears. There is nothing in Milton's syntax to mislead. Take the bare outline of the passage:—"Mirth, admit me of thy crue to . . . live with thee . . ., to hear the lark . . .; then to come . . . and at my window bid good morrow." Evidently Masson is right when he says that it is L'Allegro, the poet, who bids good morrow; and there is no reason for believing it is the lark or the dawn, as Verity and Hustvedt severally suggest. But we cannot accept the suggestion that L'Allegro is looking in at the window and addressing those who have risen later than he. Think of the first words of Jonson's *Volpone*: "Good morning to the day"; and of those palace gates which, according to Belarius,

Are arch'd so high that giants may jet through  
And keep their impious turbans on, without  
*Good morrow to the sun.* (Cymbeline, iii. 3. 7.)

Herrick's "mad maid" begins her song—

Good morrow to the day so fair;  
Good morning, sir, to you.

Any reader may recall other illustrations of a good old custom.

L'Allegro, on waking, lies meditating. If cares have humbled his pillow, he dismisses them as "of blackest midnight born," and allows his thoughts to dwell on happier fancies. Before he rises, he hears the song of the lark, and, thus roused, he steps from his bed and, just at dawn, approaches the window, and, looking out through the frame of climbing plants, bids good-morrow to the day. Before him is the yard, where the cock struts before his dames; and soon from the distance comes the sound of the huntsman's horn.

Milton's good-morrow to the day in this early poem—like the "Hail, thou fair Heaven!" of Belarius—is uttered cheerfully, but not flippantly or as a mere conventional greeting. It has a touch of religious solemnity. It is echoed more seriously in the "Hail, holy Light," which opens the third book of *Paradise Lost*.

## BOETHIUS: CHAUCER: WALTON: LYDGATE

While editing portions of John Walton's 1410 verse-translation of the *Consolatio*, I have noted two points at least in Chaucer's rendering which may be added to the list of his mistranslations. The first is in book ii metre 5, the "Former Age."

Somnos dabat herba salubres	Boethius
. . . slepen holsum slepes upon the gras	Chaucer's Boece
Slepten this blissed folk . . . On gras	"Former Age"
And holsum slepe þei took vpon þe grene	Walton
They slept upon the wholesome grass	1609 transl.

Here Prof. Jefferson cites the French as "Il se dormient sus les herbes." If this version were used, as seems probable, by Chaucer, it may have imposed on him the notion of grass as a bed, and through him on subsequent writers. The Latin can as well mean that a vegetable diet gave good digestion and untroubled sleep.

The second case is in book iii metre 12. Orpheus at the outer gate of Hell cannot resist the impulse to turn back toward the following Eurydice.

Vidit, perdidit, occidit.	Boethius
lokede abakwarde,—and loste hir, and was deed	Chaucer's Boece
Eurydice—Sawe, Lost, and Killed	Queen Elizabeth
—doth lose and kill Her and himself	1609 transl.

Skeat here remarks that "the common story does not involve the immediate death of Orpheus." The Latin is however not *occidit* but *occidit*, "was undone." Prof. Hendrickson of Yale suggests to me comparison with *Georgics* iv, 491-2, ". . . ibi omnis Effusus labor,"—a passage doubtless in the mind of Boethius as he wrote, and a passage followed by reference to Orpheus' subsequent life on earth. The French of this bit I have not seen.

Lydgate, who for a time was credited with the Boethius-translation now attributed to Walton, seems to have used or valued the *Consolatio* much less than we would expect of a monk and a Chaucer-follower. In the eighth book of the *Fall of Princes*, when presenting the "tragedy" of Boethius, he does not even work up all the material offered him by his French original. Nevertheless, there are traces of Boethius-knowledge on his part, the most marked of which is in the *Fabula Duorum Mercatorum*, lines 743-46:

O deth, desyred in aduersite,  
 Whan thou art callyd why nylt thou wrecchys heere  
 And art so reedy in felicite  
 To com to them that the nothyng desire?

This is a rendering from the opening metre of the *Consolatio*: "Eheu quam surda miseros auertitur aure Et flentes oculos claudere saeua negat," but developed further from the context. It is both more compact and more vigorous than the prose of Chaucer at this point, so much so that it would be especially interesting to know how Lydgate became possessed of it,—also, how much Boethius-knowledge it represents.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

*Boston.*

---

#### NOTE ON SHAKESPEARE'S *KING JOHN*

Come the three corners of the world in arms  
 And we shall shock them. Naught shall make us rue  
 If England to itself do rest but true.

The sentiment contained in these lines has been traced to previous English writers but not up to now, so far as I know, to its Latin original in Sallust, *Ad Caesarem Senem de Republica Oratio* (I, 5, 2): "Aliter non orbis terrarum neque cunctae gentes conglobatae movere aut contundere queunt hoc imperium." Sallust as a rule uses Greek originals freely and in this case it is practically certain that he is adapting Plato, *Menexenus* 243 d, which is translated as follows by Jowett (Vol. 4, p. 573): "Through them the city gained the reputation of being invincible, even when attacked by all mankind. And that reputation was a true one, for the defeat which came upon us was our own doing. We were never conquered by others, and to this day we are still unconquered by them; but we were our own conquerors, and received defeat at our own hands."

*Haverford College.*

L. A. POST.

---

#### BEDE AND PAUSANIAS

An interesting parallel to Bede's account of the poet Caedmon is referred to in Pausanias's *Description of Greece*, I, xxi.

"Aeschylus said that, when he was a stripling, he fell asleep in

a field while he was watching the grapes, and that Dionysus appeared to him and bade him write tragedy; and as soon as it was day, for he wished to obey the god, he tried and found that he versified with the greatest ease. Such was the tale he told."<sup>1</sup>

If we could imagine the Caedmon story surviving only through a guide-book note referring to a statue of the poet, we might expect it to take a form strikingly similar. Are there other examples of analogous use of this motif in comparative literature or folk-lore? An investigation of this question might yield profitable results.

State University of Iowa.

NELLIE SLAYTON AURNER.

### THE PATER-SAINTSBURY DEFINITION OF CRITICISM

In Saintsbury's *History of Criticism* (III, p. 546), we read: "I do not know any place setting forth that view of criticism which I have myself always held more clearly than the Preface of the *Studies* [Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (1873)]. 'To feel the virtue of the poet, or the painter, to disengage it, to set it forth,—these are the three stages of the critic's duty.'" This definition, although set off by quotation marks, is evidently Saintsbury's summary of Pater's position, for it is not to be found in the above-mentioned Preface. As a summary, however, the definition is just to Pater.

We generally think of Pater and Saintsbury as very modern (perhaps ultra-modern) in their conception of criticism. It is therefore of some interest to find that Alexander Gerard formulated the Pater-Saintsbury definition of criticism almost a century and a half before Saintsbury wrote the above words. Says Gerard: "A critic must not only *feel*, but possess that accuracy of discernment which enables a person to *reflect* upon his feelings with distinctness, and to explain them to others" (*An Essay on Taste*, third edition, 1780, p. 170. Italics Gerard's). Gerard's three steps are essentially the same as those of Saintsbury. It is a strange piece of irony, too, that Gerard's sentence comes closer to Saintsbury's than does any single sentence in Pater's Preface.

University of Texas.

THEODORE STENBERG.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Frazer's translation (Macmillan & Co.), Vol. I, p. 29.



## REVIEWS.

*The Book of Troilus and Criseyde.* By Geoffrey Chaucer. Edited from all the known manuscripts by R. K. Root. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1926.

The difficulties surmounted by the editor of this distinguished volume, and the magnitude of his achievement, can be grasped only by one who is willing to undergo the discipline of examining the preparatory studies which Professor Root has published during the last twelve years, and which are in part summarized, and in part assumed, in the book before us. No discussion of the new edition is possible without reference to these indispensable *prolegomena*.<sup>1</sup>

Ten years ago, in his *Textual Tradition*, Professor Root established the fact that the sixteen extant manuscripts of *Troilus* present the poem in more than a single state. The revising was extensive, was deliberate, and was accomplished probably by Chaucer himself,—or, at any rate, by a writer who was as gifted as Chaucer in such matters. The broad result after this revising is an earliest version ( $\alpha$ ) and a latest one ( $\beta$ ), each represented by an ample group of manuscripts bound into a family through common and characteristic idiosyncrasies. Among the larger differences between the two states of the poem are the absence from the earlier of *Troilus*'s meditation on predestination in Book IV (ll. 953-1085) and his ascent to 'the eighte spere' recounted toward the end of Book V (ll. 1807-1827). The differences in individual lines may be illustrated by the following example (III, 503)<sup>2</sup>:

- ( $\alpha$ ) Neigh half this book, of which hym liste nat write.
- ( $\beta$ ) An hondred vers, of which hym liste nat write.

Lying between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  is a group of manuscripts ( $\gamma$ ) derived before the revision was complete, and showing sometimes the reading of  $\alpha$  and sometimes that of  $\beta$ . Very rarely do  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  present three separate authentic readings of an individual line.<sup>3</sup> Although the  $\gamma$  group includes some of the handsomest and most correctly transcribed manuscripts, and although it provides invaluable evidence for many readings, it is not to be regarded as a separate version of the poem of equal importance with  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

<sup>1</sup> *Specimen Extracts from the Nine Known Unprinted MSS. of Chaucer's 'Troilus,'* ed. by W. S. McCormick and R. K. Root, Chaucer Society, London, 1914; R. K. Root, *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's 'Troilus,'* Chaucer Society, London, 1914; R. K. Root, *The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's 'Troilus,'* Chaucer Society, London, 1916.

<sup>2</sup> See Root, *Textual Tradition*, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup> These rare instances are listed by Root (*Textual Tradition*, p. 261), and adequately recorded in the edition.

It is fair to observe, in passing, that Professor Root's doctrine of the two outstanding versions has recently been somewhat confidently challenged by Dr. Brusendorff, who writes, "Accordingly there do not really exist two versions of *Troilus*, but only traces of the many corrections which Chaucer naturally made in the course of composition."<sup>4</sup> It is, of course, upon these "many corrections,"—some of them far more cogent than Dr. Brusendorff allows his reader to see,—that the doctrine of the two versions rests. If, then, Dr. Brusendorff admits that Chaucer himself did a certain amount of revising, and if he can say concerning such major passages as *Troilus's* meditation on predestination and the ascent to the eighth sphere, "It is quite possible that these passages were composed a little later than their surroundings,"<sup>5</sup>—if he can make such concessions as these, he goes rather far toward delivering himself into Professor Root's hands. The actual evidence that the Danish critic cites seems to me to be largely erroneous or irrelevant, as I venture to show by one example. One of several kinds of evidence by which Professor Root discriminates between his two versions is the closeness with which  $\alpha$  translates certain passages of *Filostrato* which in  $\beta$  are modified with notable freedom,—the freedom, it is inferred, of a reviser. Dr. Brusendorff correctly observes that for the opening phrase of the line (III, 1779, "*In tyme of trewe*, on haukyng wolde he ride," two  $\alpha$  MSS (H<sub>2</sub> and Ph) stand apart in giving the reading *Out of Troy*, which is obviously a departure from the Italian phrase, *Ne' tempi delle triegue* so closely translated by all the other MSS in the words *In tyme of trewe*. He then would give us to understand that Professor Root is committed to this erratic reading (*Out of Troy*) of two  $\alpha$  MSS as being the "revised reading." In this implication Dr. Brusendorff is, I think, completely in error. Professor Root has not drawn the inference attributed to him,<sup>6</sup> and he appears to be so far from regarding *Out of Troy* as a "revised reading," and to be so sure of its corrupt character, that he does not even record it in his edition.<sup>7</sup>

What Dr. Brusendorff seeks above all, however, is support for his hypothesis concerning the circumstances under which Chaucer "published" his poem. He holds that the poet sent his manuscript of *Troilus* forth only at the very end of his labors upon it, after he had made, at one time or another, all the changes he desired, and that the alleged "versions" result merely from scribal

<sup>4</sup> Aage Brusendorff, *The Chaucer Tradition*, London and Copenhagen, [1925], p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> Brusendorff, p. 170.

<sup>6</sup> See *Specimen Extracts*, pp. iii, 67; *Textual Tradition*, p. 145.

<sup>7</sup> Dr. Brusendorff seems not to have understood that in printing a reading in column (b) of *Specimen Extracts* (pp. 63-72) the editors do not thereby announce this reading as an authentic revision. See *Specimen Extracts*, Preface, p. iii.

bungling with the additions and changes which Chaucer had entered upon scraps of parchment and in marginal and interlinear spaces.<sup>8</sup> The hypothesis of Professor Root is that Chaucer revised his poem progressively, and "released" it at more than one stage of his work upon it.<sup>9</sup> Although I happen to find Professor Root's the more intelligible of the two hypotheses, I infer that students of Chaucer will regard both theories as of only secondary importance. The essential consideration would seem to be not Chaucer's policy of publication, but rather the actual evidences from the manuscripts as to Chaucer's authentic changes in the text of his poem.

An adequate edition of *Troilus*, then, must clearly present the earliest version of the poem ( $\alpha$ ) and the latest revised form ( $\beta$ ); and it will most appropriately give prominence to Chaucer's latest version by printing it as the text to be read, the  $\alpha$  version being recorded in variant readings. In printing a  $\beta$  text Professor Root might have been expected to adopt as his basic document the best  $\beta$  manuscript; but unfortunately the only authorities which give  $\beta$  readings throughout (Rawlinson Poet. 163 = R, and Caxton 1483 [?] = Cx) are so corrupt that to base one's text upon one of them 'would mean an almost complete rewriting of the basal MS. to bring it into linguistic and metrical conformity with Chaucer's known usage.'<sup>10</sup> Such a task of textual reconstruction *in vacuo* Professor Root wisely declines. He might have taken as his basis St. John's College MS L. 1. (J), as did McCormick in the Globe edition, since this  $\beta$  manuscript is remarkably free from scribal blunders, and is orthographically consistent throughout. But serious disadvantage would have arisen from the fact that J is a composite, and after line 430 of Book IV ceases to give  $\beta$  readings. Since, then, no acceptable MS. is forthcoming from the  $\beta$  group, Professor Root seeks a reliable authority lying as near as possible to this group, "a MS. as free as possible from individual corruptions, and the inheritor of a pure tradition, one in which contamination has not played a large part, a MS. reasonably consistent in spelling, and in its forms as close as may be to Chaucer's known usage, and one which is throughout the poem true to a single type of text."<sup>11</sup> These conditions are met best by three MSS of the  $\gamma$  group: Corpus Christi Coll. 61 (Cp), Campsall (Cl), and Harleian 2280 (H<sub>1</sub>), from which Professor Root chooses as his basic authority Cp. Roughly described, the editor's task, then, is to alter the text of Cp into a  $\beta$  text, a process for which he uses

<sup>8</sup> See Brusendorff, pp. 169-174.

<sup>9</sup> See Root, *Textual Tradition*, pp. 258-260; *Edition* pp. lxxi-lxxxi.

<sup>10</sup> Root, *Textual Tradition*, p. 271.

<sup>11</sup> Root, *Textual Tradition*, p. 271.

primarily J, through the two-thirds of the poem for which J gives a  $\beta$  text. The editorial stages through which Cp passes are these:<sup>12</sup>

(1) Through a comparison with the other  $\gamma$  MSS, Cp is purged of the corruptions arising from its immediate scribe.

(2) Then through a comparison with the MSS outside the  $\gamma$  group are eliminated the errors and editings of the scribe who copied the lost  $\gamma$  original.

(3) Then into this purged  $\gamma$  version are incorporated all the attested  $\beta$  revisions which are not already present in the purged  $\gamma$ .

For the second and third of these steps the authority chiefly relied upon is J.

This process of "beta-izing" Cp will not seem drastic to one who remembers "that  $\gamma$  was derived after most of the revisions, except those of Book III, had been completed, and that thus the text of  $\gamma$  is in the main a  $\beta$  authority."<sup>13</sup> If in the paragraphs in which he explains his editorial method Professor Root had included a few applications of it, he would, I think, have added clarity and cogency to his exposition, and might have converted those who may be inclined to hold that a  $\beta$  text is obtainable only through using a  $\beta$  MS as a basis.<sup>14</sup> After a somewhat earnest, but necessarily incomplete, examination of the possibilities, the present reviewer, at any rate, is convinced that, in view of the actual conditions of the MSS, Professor Root's method offers the nearest approach to Chaucer's final version which we can expect to attain with our present resources.

In applying his method Professor Root gives the reader all the information necessary for supporting his text, and, in general, no more. Relying upon such of the originals as are in print, I have found no case in which he fails to give accurately the attested readings of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  texts, as well as "the aberrant variants of the lost  $\gamma$  original." He gives a *complete* list of variants only in cases in which he regards the constitution or interpretation of the text as in doubt. "Except in such cases," he remarks, "no useful purpose would be served by encumbering the page with the careless or stupid aberrations of some poor scribe."<sup>15</sup> In Professor Root's edition, then, we have always sufficiently convincing evidence of the soundness of the text; but from the information supplied we cannot reconstitute the manuscripts. Although one might have been glad to have complete variants from at least the two basic MSS,<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See Root, *Textual Tradition*, pp. 271-272; *Edition*, pp. lxxxi-lxxxiv.

<sup>13</sup> Root, *Edition*, p. lxxix.

<sup>14</sup> In a review of Root's *Textual Tradition*, the late J. Douglas Bruce took this position. See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxiv, (1919), 37-40.

<sup>15</sup> *Edition*, p. lxxxvii.

<sup>16</sup> For examples of scribal blunders in these MSS. see I, 539 (Cp), III, 635 (J), and III, 303 (J), treated by Root in *Textual Tradition*, pp. 63, 163, and 178.

I have found no instance in which such additional information would have any essential bearing upon the soundness of the text before us.

In interpreting the evidences of his manuscripts, Professor Root is admirably conservative. In the line, "Ne leiser have hire speches to *fulfille*" (III, 510), the MSS, without exception, read *fulfille*; hence he, in contrast to Skeat and the Globe editor, resists the emendation *fulfelle*, although this is a permissible Kentish form which would meet the requirement of riming with *telle*. Sound caution appears again in such a reading as the following (I, 362-364):

his spirit mette  
That he hire saugh, and temple, and al the wise  
Right of hire look.

Adopting the unique reading of his basic MS (C1), Skeat prints *a temple*; and the Globe editor adopts *in temple* from a single *a* MS (H<sub>4</sub>). Professor Root adheres to the unquestionably attested *and temple*, and must be content with a somewhat clumsy, but still intelligible, line. Possibly, however, conservatism becomes a trifle inhumane when it offers the following stanza without signal of danger (III, 1415-1421):

Whan that the cok, comune astrologer,  
Gan on his brest to bete, and after crowe,  
And Lucifer, the dayes messenger,  
Gan for to rise, and oute hire stremes throwe,  
And estward roos, to hym that koude it knowe,  
Fortuna Major, that anoon Criseyde,  
With herte soor, to Troilus thus seyde.

All the manuscripts read *that anoon Criseyde*,—with unintelligible syntax. "It would seem," observes Professor Root,<sup>17</sup> "that Chaucer changed his mind in the middle of the sentence, and never revised the passage." Skeat emends: [*than*] *anoon Criseyde*. Even the more conservative editor would, I think, be justified in at least warning the puzzled reader, by some conventional sign, that the passage does not make sense.

But it is precisely through a comparison of Skeat's edition with the present one that the student becomes most admiring of Professor Root's method and integrity. Those of our generation who fail to revere Skeat's immense achievement in the *Oxford Chaucer*, do themselves discredit; but our reverence must not blind us to the fact that Skeat's text of *Troilus* (1894) was produced through a defective method, being "a print of  $\gamma$ , purged of its obvious errors by an eclectic adoption of readings from other authorities."<sup>18</sup> The result of this somewhat irresponsible procedure,

<sup>17</sup> *Edition*, p. 489.

<sup>18</sup> See Root, *Edition*, p. lxix.

by an editor of great scholarship and fine taste, is a version very agreeable to read. To most persons Skeat's eclectic reading (i, 747), "Eek som-tyme it is craft to seme fle," will probably afford more immediate pleasure than will Professor Root's abundantly attested version, "Ek som tyme it is a craft to seme fle." But in order to attain the desired smoothness Skeat completely deserted his  $\gamma$  authorities, and silently selected a reading found in only one  $\alpha$  MS and two  $\beta$  MSS. Such an unsupported attempt to rescue Chaucer's metrical reputation seems ill-advised. "It is not to be supposed," remarks Professor Root candidly, "that Chaucer wrote only lines of mechanically regular metre, nor that he always succeeded in avoiding awkward constructions."<sup>19</sup> The most notable divergences between the two editions arise in cases in which Skeat's  $\gamma$  MSS give the unrevised  $\alpha$  reading, against Professor Root's revised  $\beta$  version, as in the following (III, 1392-1393):

To techen hem that they ben in the vyce  
And loveres nought, al-though they holde hem nyce. (Skeat)

To techen hem that coveytise is vice,  
And love is vertu, though men holde it nyce. (Root)

From every point of view, Professor Root's advantage, in such instances, is very great indeed.<sup>20</sup>

The other modern edition with which Professor Root inevitably comes into competition is the *Globe* (1898). This edition, like the one under review, presents a  $\beta$  text of *Troilus*, and the basis of it is the  $\beta$  MS J, used largely by Professor Root for correcting the text of Cp into a  $\beta$  text. But since after line 430 of Book IV J ceases to give a  $\beta$  text, the effect upon the *Globe* edition is "the printing of what is predominantly a  $\beta$  text for the first two-thirds of the poem, and of what is predominantly an  $\alpha$  text for the remainder."<sup>21</sup> The differences between the two editions, however, even within the last third of the poem, are not so numerous as one might expect. In the first 500 lines of Book V I find noteworthy differences in only 15 lines. In each case Professor Root has the advantage, either because the *Globe* editor follows the  $\alpha$  reading of his chosen MS, or because he resorts to emendation or eclecticism.<sup>22</sup>

In his primary task of producing a sound text, then, Professor Root's success is essentially complete. He has done far more than improve upon his editorial predecessors; he has adopted a correct scientific method, and has followed it unswervingly. Upon the

<sup>19</sup> *Edition*, p. lxxxiv.

<sup>20</sup> After comparing the Skeat and Root texts throughout about 3000 lines, I estimate that through the poem as a whole the two texts probably show noteworthy differences in between 5 and 10 per cent. of the lines.

<sup>21</sup> See Root, *Edition*, p. lxx.

<sup>22</sup> Through the poem as a whole the *Globe* edition probably differs from Root's, in a noteworthy way, in only one or two per cent. of the lines.

basis of the manuscripts now available a better text is not to be expected or desired.

The finality which characterizes the text could not, in the nature of things, be attained for the annotation and commentary. In these matters the editor can only *select* from the mass of information and opinion in his possession at the moment of publication. He cannot conceivably satisfy the possible demands of each reader. The wise reader, ought, perhaps, to express gratitude for what is given rather than disappointment over what is withheld. The reviewer of so important a book, however, would be unworthy of his commission if he were silent as to the limitations that the editor has set for himself in this part of his labors.

In his notes, at the end of the volume, devoted chiefly to literary elucidation of the text, Professor Root has Skeat as his sole competitor. He has very palpably surpassed his predecessor in the amount of information supplied, and the whole body of annotation is invariably apt, lucid, and freshly evaluated. Without the slightest charge of dereliction, or attempt at completeness, I venture to note a few types of omission. I myself should have been glad to have notes upon the following expressions: *blase of straw* (iv, 184)<sup>23</sup>; *feyned loves* (v, 1848)<sup>24</sup>; *I, that god of loves servauntes serve* (i, 15)<sup>25</sup>; *Tregentyll* (Colophon of MS R).<sup>26</sup> In certain notes, already very able, students of the poem might have been aided by specific references to studies presenting additional information, or divergent views. The following are examples: iv, 953-1085 (Troilus on God's foreknowledge)<sup>27</sup>; iii, 1420 (Fortuna Major)<sup>28</sup>; v, 813-814 (Portrait of Criseyde)<sup>29</sup>; v, 360-385 (Pandaros on dreams)<sup>30</sup>; v, 1558 (aventail)<sup>31</sup>; iv, 176-196 (Hector's befriending of Criseyde)<sup>32</sup>; ii, 1398 (Scene at the house of Deiphebus)<sup>33</sup>; ii, 522-539 and iii, 15-17 (The terminology of Christianity applied to Courtly Love).<sup>34</sup> In the note on ii, 610-644 (see also p. xxx) Professor Root seems to infer from *Filostrato*

<sup>23</sup> See Brown, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxvi (1912), 210.

<sup>24</sup> See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xl (1925), 272-273.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *servus servorum Dei* of papal bulls; Dodd, *Courtly Love*, p. 192.

<sup>26</sup> See Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Mss.*, iii (1895), 318; McCormick, in *Furnivall Miscellany*, London, 1901, p. 299; MacCracken, in *Athenaeum*, Feb. 29, 1908, p. 258.

<sup>27</sup> See Patch, in *Jour. of Eng. and Germ. Philol.*, xvii (1918), 399-422.

<sup>28</sup> See Curry, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii (1923), 94-96.

<sup>29</sup> See Griffin, in *Jour. of Eng. and Germ. Philol.*, xx (1921), 39-46.

<sup>30</sup> See Curry, in *Englische Studien*, lviii (1924), 24-60.

<sup>31</sup> See Hamilton, in *Modern Philology*, iii (1906), 541-546.

<sup>32</sup> See Cummings, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (University of Cincinnati Studies, Vol. x, Part 2), Cincinnati, 1916, pp. 71, 84-85.

<sup>33</sup> See *id.*, pp. 59-61.

<sup>34</sup> See Dodd, *Courtly Love*, pp. 191 ff.

II, 82 that Troilo and Pandaro *ride* past Criseida's window. I infer rather that the horse is invented by Chaucer as part of the two brilliant riding-scenes which he adds to the story.

In an illuminating note upon line 1797 of Book V Professor Root observes, "There is evidence in the poem itself that Chaucer had in mind a public reading of his poem." One regrets that the editor did not bring the evidence forward and comment upon it, especially in view of the fact that Chaucer seems not to be of one mind in this matter. At times the poet seems to be writing for *readers*,<sup>35</sup> and again, for *auditors*.<sup>36</sup> A discussion of these facts would have been particularly appropriate in the present edition, since Professor Root's basic MS (Cp) contains a remarkable full-page painting which presumably represents Chaucer as reciting his poem to a courtly company.<sup>37</sup>

Passing from the notes at the end of the volume to the introductory commentary at the beginning, we find succinct essays upon authorship, date, sources, manuscripts, and text,—essays so adequate that a reviewer can merely record his admiration.<sup>38</sup>

Professor Root's modest declaration that he has not attempted aesthetic appraisals, "except incidentally and by implication,"<sup>39</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See, for example, *T. and C.* v, 270 ('Thow, redere').

<sup>36</sup> See, for example, *T. and C.* I, 5; I, 450; II, 30; II, 43-46, II, 1751; III, 499.

<sup>37</sup> See Root, *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Troilus*, p. 7. Brusendorff (*op. cit.*) has recently published two reproductions of this painting (Plates I and II), and has discussed it at some length (pp. 19-25). On the general matter of the poet's reading his works aloud see Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 110-111, 170; Root, in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXVIII (1913), pp. 421, 429; L. M. Mott, *The System of Courtly Love*, Boston, 1896, p. 23; Kittredge, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus* (Chaucer Society, Second Series, 42), p. 52; K. J. Holzknecht, *Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, 1923, p. 80.

<sup>38</sup> Some students of the poem will probably feel that Professor Root (See p. xxx, note 49) ought to have constructed a new table showing the indebtedness of *Troilus* to *Filostrato*, to supersede the estimates of Rossetti and the tables of Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, II, 461, 467, 474, 484, and 494-495). Cummings (*The Indebtedness*, pp. 50-122) provides an abundance of suggestions for such a reconstruction; and R. Fischer's, *Zu den Kunstformen des mittelalterlichen Epos*, Vienna, 1899, pp. 217-370, may still deserve consideration. To foot-note 115 on p. li might be added a reference to H. N. MacCracken, *More Odd Texts of Chaucer's 'Troilus'*, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxv (1910), 126-127. In connection with page xxix reference might be made to MacCracken's *The Source of Keats's 'Eve of St. Agnes'* (*Modern Philology*, v [1907], 145-152), especially since this same study was somewhat unfortunately overlooked by Cummings (*The Indebtedness*, p. 11). In connection with the excellent paragraph on Horace on p. xliii, one might refer to C. L. Wrenn, *Chaucer's Knowledge of Horace*, in *Mod. Lang. Review*, xviii (1923), 286-292. Wrenn suggests a source in Horace for *T. and C.* II, 484-489,—a passage which Professor Root does not annotate.

<sup>39</sup> Preface, p. vii.



will not blind the reader to the grace and originality of the introductory sections concerning the personages, the conduct of the action, and the moral import of the poem. Perhaps the most arresting observation here concerns the three stanzas<sup>40</sup> of the epilogue in which Chaucer adapts a passage from *Teseide* to the purpose of recounting the ascent of Troilus's soul to the eighth sphere. From this point of vantage Troilus for the first time discerns the vanity of earthly love and pleasure in comparison with the perfect felicity of heaven on which our hearts should be set. As this realization comes to him,

in hym self he lough right at the wo  
Of hem that wepten for his deth so faste.

"He has taken life too seriously," remarks Professor Root; "now, like the poet who created him, he sees in life a high but comic irony. . . . The last we hear from Troilus is a peal of celestial laughter."<sup>41</sup> I confess that in the brilliant passage from which I can quote only too briefly, Professor Root seems to me to deal somewhat violently with both the words of the text and the spirit of the epilogue. I cannot believe that when Chaucer wrote of Troilus that "in hym self he lough" ("he laughed *within himself*"), he meant to launch "a peal of celestial laughter."

My trifling suggestions as to modifications and additions, however, are truly negligible in the presence of Professor Root's commanding achievement. He has set a new standard for the editing of Chaucer. He has produced a volume worthy of the great poem which it presents. A higher tribute would be difficult to phrase.

KARL YOUNG.

*Yale University.*

---

*Bücher des Mittelalters* herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH VON DER LEYEN. München. F. Bruckmann A. G.

Band I. *Wunder und Taten der Heiligen* von GOSWIN FRENKEN. München, 1925. pp. xxxi, 234. M. 9.

Band II. *Sagen und Geschichten aus dem alten Frankreich und England* von WERNER SCHWARTZKOPFF und MAJA SCHWARTZKOPFF. München, 1925. pp. xx, 315. M. 10.

---

<sup>40</sup> *T. and C.* v, 1807-1827.

<sup>41</sup> *Edition*, pp. xlix-l.

Band III. *Tristan und Isolde* von FRIEDRICH RANKE. München, 1925. pp. 283. M. 10.

Band IV. *Märchen, Fabeln und Schwänke* von ERNST TEGETHOFF. München, 1925. pp. xv, 387. M. 11.

The literary enterprise, of which the four volumes here reviewed are the beginning, is so admirably planned, and, thus far, equally admirably executed, that it deserves the cordial welcome of scholars everywhere and the careful attention of students of mediaeval literature. The name of the editor is a sufficient guarantee of the scholarly nature of the undertaking, and is favorably known to the lovers of *märchen* in all lands. He is the author of an admirable little book on stories: *Das Märchen*, 2nd ed., 1917, and of an edition of the Household Tales of the Grimms, 1912, two volumes. He is more widely known by his editorship (with Paul Zaunert) of *Die Märchen der Weltliteratur*, published by Diederichs in Jena since 1912, comprising some twenty-eight volumes devoted to the tales of all parts of the globe.

The object of the present series, in the words of the editor is "to display the middle ages in their extent in time and space and history and in the unity of its civilization, the world which the millennium from the migration of nations to the Reformation embraces, blends into one great organism the eastern and western, Germanic and Christian elements and yet again leads each land and each civilization to its individual development. This aim is to be realized chiefly by the choice, interpretation and characterization of the mediaeval witnesses in order that the mediaeval life in its amazing fulness and thousandfold distinctness may spread itself before the reader living and powerful.

"The documents of the middle ages, poems, chronicles, learned and religious confessions shall ever speak. The world above and below, chivalry and Christianity, minstrel and priest, hilarity and inclination to adventure, profound earnestness and absorption in God, all shall arise before us fresh and direct.—The speech of the middle ages in its youthful strength and charm, its lofty spiritual contents and wonderful formal culture few have heard as they should be heard. It acts in our time like a miracle and is able to revive our present everywhere.—The mediaeval pictures, especially the pictures of the mediaeval manuscripts, shall show us the times as they saw themselves; there is a treasure of representations of the mediaeval ecclesiastical, chivalric and popular life, an enchanted world, which shall serve as an incomparable ornament to our *Bücher des Mittelalters*.

"A series of books, such as we here plan, is demanded by the science of the present day which strives after a new cosmopolitanism. The editors of the volumes are well-known proven scholars,

they address themselves in a language intelligible to all, to the wide circle of the cultivated and impressionable. The fact that in these volumes the middle ages reveal themselves, that in them word and picture are united richly and clearly and in perfect reproduction, distinguishes them from all other publications."

Let us now see how the above aims have been realized. The first volume is devoted to the acts and miracles of the saints, beginning with those recorded in the Apocryphal Gospels. Then follow examples taken from the great mediaeval repertoires: Gregory's *Dialogues*, the *Vitae Patrum*, *Legenda Aurea*, Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus Miraculorum*, etc. There is an excellent historical introduction and a concise bibliography precedes each class of legends, and the individual stories are provided with notes showing their origin and diffusion. Besides a list of the saints mentioned there is a very useful index of the incidents of the legends. There are sixteen full-page illustrations taken from German, French and Netherlandish MSS. of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, besides two from MSS. of the beginning of the sixteenth century; all from collections of the legends of the saints and breviaries in the state libraries of Munich and Vienna. Six of these illustrations are admirably reproduced in colors.

The editor of the second volume says that it has been his wish to show how the people of Gaul, between the Vosges and the ocean, grew to a consciousness of a peculiar nation and to a new form of epic in the youthful Old-French language. The book then is a collection of Latin and Old-French monuments, each of which represents a step or a new side of this development of mediaeval life, and each elucidates the other. These monuments begin with extracts from Merovingian chronicles in Latin, and are followed by early Old-French ecclesiastical hymns: *Saint Eulalia*, *Saint Leger*, etc. Then come the heroic chansons de gestes: the *Chanson de Roland* and other similar poems; the rhymed chronicles (the Crusades, Wace, etc.), and, finally, Old-French prose of the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, comprising extracts from Villehardouin, the Menestrel de Reims, the biographies of the Troubadours, Joinville, Froissart and Philippe de Commines. The carefully selected extracts are usually accompanied by an introduction and there is a prefatory list of works consulted. The extracts are sufficiently long (in the case of *Chanson de Roland* covering pp. 23-73) to give a good idea of the author and the period. The illustrations are sixteen in number, seven of them are from the Bayeux Tapestry, and six are beautifully reproduced in colors.

I shall examine the fourth volume out of its numerical order as it properly belongs with the first and second, being a volume of extracts from the stories, jests, and fables of all the lands of

Europe: Latin, Celtic, French, German, Dutch, Scandinavian, English, Italian and Spanish. For the first category the editor has drawn on such works as the Seven Wise Masters, the *Disciplina Clericalis*, the *Gesta Romanorum*, etc. The Celtic extracts are from Jacob's *Celtic Fairy Tales* (Condlar's journey to the other world), the *Voyage of Maeldun*, the *Mabinogion*, etc. The French element is represented by examples from Chrétien de Troyes, Marie de France, *Aucassin and Nicolette*, the *Fabliaux*, etc. The German contingent is taken from the epic poems of Wolfram of Eschenbach, Gottfried of Strassburg's *Tristan and Isolde*, von der Hagen's *Gesamtabenteuer*, Gerhard von Minden's *Fabein*, etc. Holland is represented by one extract only, the *Land of Cocagne*. The Scandinavian extracts are from the *Prose Edda* of Snorri Sturluson, the Hamlet story from Saxo-Grammaticus, etc. England is shown in *Thomas the Rhymer*, *Gawain and the Green Knight*, the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, *King Lear*, from Layamon's *Brut*, etc. Southern Europe is shown by Italian stories from the *Centio Novelle Antiche*, Boccaccio, Sacchetti, Sercambi, Poggio's *Facetiae*, Masuccio Salernitano, etc. Spain has four stories: the *Dean of Santiago*, the *King's New Clothes*, both from the Conde Lucanor, and a romance, *Conde Alarcos*. This long list of stories is closed by an extract from *Don Quixote* (I. 6), where the Priest and the Barber sit in judgement on the Romances of Chivalry in the Knight's library. The method adopted by the editor of the second volume of the series has been followed here; viz. a prefatory note is given to each extract or class of extracts. These introductions are often of considerable length and constitute a valuable feature of the work. At the end are the usual literary references and a very full index of incidents. The sixteen plates, five in colors, are admirably executed.

The volumes thus far examined have contained miscellaneous extracts from longer sources; the third volume is devoted entirely to a single work, one of the most famous, however, of all the mediaeval romances, *Tristan and Isolde*. The lovers of Sir Walter Scott will recall that he was the first to awaken an interest in the comparative study of this great poem. In 1804 he published the English version contained in the Auchinleck Ms. in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh. Scott knew the Welsh accounts, the fragment of the *Folie Tristan* in the Douce Ms., the *Lai du Chevre-feuille* of Marie de France, and the French prose romance. As Golther says, he knew that Chrétien de Troyes had written a poem on Tristan. Scott's national prejudice, however, led him to ascribe the English poem to Thomas of Ercildoune and to make it the source of the French versions. Scott clung to his belief in the antiquity of the version he published and in the last novel he wrote, *Castle Dangerous*, he makes the minstrel Bertram offer

as a pretext for his visit to the Castle his desire to seek the poems of Thomas of Ercildoune said to be preserved in the fortress.

Another personal allusion may be made here to an American scholar, whose untimely death has cut short her valuable labors in this field. I allude to Mrs. Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis, to whose memory this volume is appropriately dedicated by the editor.

The contents of the volume are briefly as follows: the Celtic Tristan poetry, the Forest life; the oldest Tristan epic, the Love potion, Isolde of the White Hand. Then follow extracts from the poems of Eilhart of Oberg, Béroul; the episodic poems of Marie de France alluded to above, the *Nightingale* from *Donnei des Amants*, the *Folie Tristan*; and copious selections from the great poems of Thomas and Gottfried of Strassburg. A concluding chapter is devoted to the vicissitudes of the Tristan poems in the later middle ages in France, Germany and Iceland. Bibliographical references are given in the notes to the text. The illustrations in this volume, seventeen in number, four in colors, deserve special mention, and have received unusually full explanations from the editor. Five are reproductions of the Wienhauser tapestries, and one from the tapestry formerly at Erfurt, and now in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Two of the Bozen frescoes are given and two plates are devoted to the carvings of the St. Petersburg casket. Several plates are devoted to the Chertsey tiles, which Professor R. S. Loomis has made the subject of a special work published by the University of Illinois, 1916.

In concluding this notice the reviewer wishes to express his admiration of the outward form as well as of the intellectual contents of this remarkable series. The paper, print, illustrations, are worthy of the highest praise. The inward arrangement and strict scholarship are united with an interesting style, and afford fascinating reading for those who have no special knowledge of the subjects treated in these four volumes. If these works, or similar ones, could be put into the hands of college students they could not fail to attract them to the study of a fascinating period and perhaps fix for the future their field of work. The series deserves translation, and we are glad to say that the worthy publisher hopes to continue the enterprise with volumes on *Travels and Adventures*, *Folk songs and Love songs*, the *Edda*, *Masters of Mysticism*, the *Arabians*, the *Prayer Book*, etc.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

---

*The Merveilleux in the Epic.* By RALPH C. WILLIAMS. Paris: Champion, 1925. Pp. 152.

The author of this volume is to be congratulated on the useful purpose for which his book was planned. Nothing more illuminates for later readers the literature of a past age than some knowledge of the critical ideas whose influence it felt; and the tracing of a single aspect of critical theory in its development through an extended period or series of periods is often far more enlightening than a more general treatment of literary criticism as a whole. And so a work of more limited scope, such as the present study, might quite well be, in certain ways, of greater service than the general treatises, monumentally valuable in themselves, of (for example) Spingarn, Saintsbury, or (in a somewhat narrower field) Bacci and Trabalza. Cases in point, already touching on the subject of the *Merveilleux*, are Hippolyte Rigault's excellent *Histoire de la Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, which appeared exactly seventy years ago (Paris, 1856), and also the more recent work of the Jesuit P. V. Delaporte: *Du Merveilleux dans la Littérature Française sous le règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1891), an admirably clear and adequate treatment (despite some slight religious bias) of the matter in the last five chapters of the present volume; though the latter treats the eighteenth century (Chapter Five) in more detail.

Essentially, Professor Williams' book summarizes for us French ideas during three centuries on the whole matter of the *Merveilleux* in the epic, and throughout emphasizes especially the conflict of opinions between the advocates of a pagan supernatural and those of the Christian. The author wisely limits himself to considering the theoretical discussions of the epic marvellous alone, without attempting to take up the marvellous in practice, as manifested in the epic poetry itself. He divides his matter under seven headings: *Introduction*; I. *The Marvelous in Greece, Rome, and Italy*; II. *The Sixteenth Century*; III. *The Seventeenth Century. The Advocates of the Merveilleux chrétien*; IV. *The Seventeenth Century. The Partisans of the Pagan Marvelous*; V. *The Eighteenth Century*; and *Conclusion*. An extensive bibliography follows, arranged in the main chronologically; but there is unfortunately no index, nor even an analytical table of contents. This lack largely handicaps the reference value of the volume; it is to be hoped that, if a second edition of the book should be forthcoming, this defect may be supplied. And with the possibility of a second edition in mind, the following comments may perhaps be found of use: (1) It would, perhaps, make for greater clearness if the theorists discussed in the various categories and sub-categories were treated with more regard to the chronological order of the expression of their ideas. On pp. 134-135, for example, we read:

La Harpe does not agree with those who censure Tasso for employing magic, for he thinks that the enchanted forest produces a splendid effect. He, however, agrees with Boileau in saying that Tasso's magic would not have greatly succeeded if it had not been for Clarinde and Armide, and he admits that the magic of the *Gerusalemme liberata* would not please in the *Henriade*. L'Abbé Goujet believes that magic is essential to the Christian poem which one wishes to qualify as epic and praises Tasso's use of magic. Chateaubriand laments the fact that Tasso's timidity forced him to employ the little springs of magic instead of a more rounded marvelous, for magic is a marvelous of a lesser kind. Le Moyne believes that magic can be employed but sparingly, but this is not Marmontel's idea for he sees in it a vast field of fiction where one can allow one's imagination to roam untrammelled. Baillet. . . .

These writers expressed their opinions in the years 1797, 1730 c., 1800, 1658, 1760 c., and 1685, respectively; in the absence of foot-notes (of which, incidentally, there is something of a lack all through the book, more than nine-tenths of the opinions quoted lacking all reference to page or even work), the less informed reader is likely to be misled by making the quite pardonable supposition that the citations are more or less in chronological order. This observation applies throughout; and, except for the division into centuries, the reader is given no opportunity of tracing the development of the various ideas. (2) In several passages the expression does not make the sense quite clear. It is hard to tell, for example, whether the "He" of the last clause in the following lines should refer to Marmontel, Frain de Tremblay, or Tatien:

It is not in modern poetry that one should seek the marvelous, it would be out of place, says Marmontel. The only thing that can be admitted is an allegory rather than the marvelous properly so-called. We read in the work of Frain de Tremblay that Tatien had said that if one reduced what the poets said to an allegorical meaning, the gods of the pagans would be annihilated. He makes fun of a certain Metrodore de Lampagne . . . (p. 110).

There are a number of similar cases which might well be clarified for the benefit of the uninformed reader. Occasionally a passage is a little obscure for other reasons; e. g. (on p. 44):

In the preface to the last twelve books of *La Pucelle*, Chapelain says that judges will observe . . . whether sacred things have been treated with reverence and whether in the employment of angels, saints, and demons, whether or not a reasonable emulation of the use of pagan divinities has not been evident, and also the avoidance of confounding good religion with bad, and uniting matters which are mutually antagonistic, possessing only an absolute incompatibility.

A few phrases, too, such as "poetic persons" (meaning *personifications*), "moral personages" (*allegorical figures*), "fables" (*mythology*), "the portrait of Renown" (*the figure of Rumour*), etc., might be, perhaps, either defined or simplified for the understanding of the less sophisticated. (3) The use of vernacular titles in place of the original Latin should probably rather be avoided; and

the names of literary characters might possibly (in an English work) better be quoted in the original form. So for *Pharsale* read *Pharsalia* (p. 11), for *Antoniade* read *Vita Divi Antonii* (p. 13), for *Parto della Vergine* read *De Partu Virginis* (p. 14), for *Christiade* read *Christias* (*ib.*), etc.; and (p. 114 and *passim*) for "Renaud" read "Rinaldo," for "Ubalde" read "Ubaldo," for "Armide" read "Armida," and so following. (4) In Chapter Two, either the contents of the chapter or else the summary conclusion on p. 22 might be in some way modified. The conclusion runs: "It is very evident then, that . . . the epic poetry of the sixteenth century and the theoretical pronouncements are in most part entirely pagan." The last phrase doubtless is correct; but the chapter has not really shown it. Only five writers have up to this point been mentioned; of these, three are cited as frankly anti-pagan, while the only two paganists, Ronsard and Tristan l'Hermite, who, though included here (p. 19), belongs in the seventeenth century, both specifically apologise for introducing pagan figures. (5) Minor corrigenda: p. 14, l. 17, for (1587) read (1586); *ibid.* l. 18, for (1594) read (composed in 1594); *ibid.* l. 20, for (1603) read (1585: composed at least twenty years earlier); p. 16, l. 23, for Bernardo Tasso states . . . read Elsewhere Giraldis states . . . ; and *ibid.*, footnote, read . . . , Padova, II, 307. [The letter in question, though printed with the *Lettere* of Bernardo Tasso, is by G.-B. Giraldis (Cinthio).]; p. 37, l. 15, omit that; p. 141, l. 8, for *Elhica* read *Ethnica*; p. 148, l. 5, "1706. Saint-Evremond.—*Oeuvres*, IV, Londres": the main pertinent work of this author, *Du merveilleux qui se trouve dans les poèmes des anciens*, might have been cited under 1688; p. 151, l. 13, "1761. Trailh.—*Querelles littéraires*, Paris": further bibliographical details would be helpful: no such writer is known to Lanson, nor even any for whose name this could conceivably be a misprint; p. 152, l. 28 f., read *letterari italiani*. In the bibliography throughout, it would be helpful to include at least initials of all writers; especially when, *e. g.*, "Racine" means not the *grand poète* but his son, Louis Racine. There are also in the bibliography some minor typographical and linguistic inconsistencies which can readily be corrected. (6) The following writers cited in the text should be included in the bibliography: Balzac (pp. 27, 135, etc.), Delille (p. 4), Strada (p. 61), Voltaire, *Mémoires pour l'histoire des sciences et des arts* (pp. 89-90), Calvel (pp. 92, 111), Cocci, *Lettre sur la Henriade* (p. 100), Lancelin (p. 111), *et al.* Opinions of these and other writers are cited, often at some length, without mention (in most cases) even of the work involved. The interesting little volume usually ascribed to François de Callières, *Histoire poétique des anciens et des modernes*, on which Swift seems undoubtedly to have modelled his more famous *Battle of the Books*, was also worthy of inclusion both in text and bibliography. It should be noted in conclusion that the



proof-reading seems to have been surprisingly well done. Although printed in France, and apparently in some haste, not a single misspelled English word or name appears. *Félicitons M. Champion!*

WALTER L. BULLOCK.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

*An Explanatory Course in General Language*, developed by LUCY MALLARY BUGBEE and others. Pp. xii + 258. Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., New York, 1926.

*The Gateway to English*, by H. A. TREBLE and G. H. VALLINS. Pp. iv + 107. Oxford University Press, American Branch. New York, 1926. \$0.70.

Both the books under review were written for use in the first-year class of the secondary school. They therefore are not of immediate interest to the college and university teachers whom this journal primarily serves. At the same time, the university men certainly ought to keep up with what is being done in the secondary schools, and the authors of high-school text-books may find it worth their while to hear what the university men have to say. And let me say, first of all, that both books are attempts to meet real needs, to solve real problems. The authors of *General Language* tell us that they purpose "to offer all pupils the story of the development of language in general, and in particular an understanding of the historical place of their own language--English; . . . to present a foretaste of the study of foreign language . . . ; to give the individual pupil, his teachers, and his parents some basis for judging whether he should continue the study of a specific language further; . . ." These are good aims. An explanatory course well carried out along those lines ought to be a useful thing. If then the book under review is not wholly successful, that is not the fault of the idea behind it. The trouble lies rather in the scholarship of the authors. The book ought to have been written by a grammarian of distinction. The authors may retort that no grammarian undertook the task, and they did, as well as they could, a job that otherwise would have been left undone. Quite so. And yet it is a pity that no expert was available, if only to correct obvious errors. Let me give a few illustrations of what I mean. On p. xii we find a linguistic map of Europe (an excellent idea in itself). Here practically the whole of Scotland (including the Lowlands!) and all Ireland except one corner, are shaded to mark Gaelic-speaking territory, and Lettish and Lithuanian are put down under the heading "Slavonic lan-

guages." The authors seem positive that paleolithic man "had developed no regular system of language" (p. 8). They attempt to explain how language arose, but seem unfamiliar with the works of such authorities as Jespersen. They tell of the development of writing, but leave out the syllabary. For their ideas about race, they depend on Madison Grant's *Passing of the Great Race*, a work which they specifically recommend to the teacher. They lay upon the poor philologists the burden of saying that "the original Aryan language probably originated about 3000 B. C., in the northern part of Europe amongst the Nordic people" (p. 20). They promote the popular superstition that English is a mixed language (p. 22), and they echo the belief that Chaucer is "the father of the English language" (p. 37). Needless to say, they attribute primarily or even exclusively to the Norman Conquest the changes that made Old into Middle English. They explain that French *r* "should always be trilled, either at the end of the tongue or with the palate. The latter pronunciation is exceedingly difficult for an American" (p. 99). One would certainly agree to the last statement, and one might add that it would be exceedingly difficult for a Frenchman too. They tell us that the Germans are Nordics, though they admit that in Württemberg there are traces of Alpines (p. 176). Under "Names of Boys" we find a long list of "Teutonic" names, including *Alfred*, and a short list of "Anglo-Saxon" names, including the Scandinavian *Harold*. I judge that *Teutonic* here means 'German' rather than 'Germanic.' Under "Names of Girls" I miss the "Anglo-Saxon" *Audrey*. The authors seem to be under the impression that the Romans conquered all the British Isles; indeed, a pupil, unless he were wide awake, would get the idea that Julius Caesar himself had done this (pp. 30 ff.). We are also told that "about 560 A. D. Rome was sacked by the Goths and Vandals, and the great power of Rome was ended" (p. 30). In sum, the authors have not given us a book as trustworthy as a high-school text-book ought to be.

The same cannot be said of *The Gateway to English*, which strikes me as a good job. The authors enliven their pages with all manner of drawings, which serve to make vivid and concrete the points which they make. These drawings ought to make grammar interesting to the dullest of school-children. The book was written to fit the English school-system, however, and I do not know whether the English departments in American high-schools would take to it.

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

---

*Trobadorgedichte. Dreissig Stücke altprovenzalischer Lyrik. Zum ersten Male kritisch bearbeitet von ADOLF KOLSEN. (Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte, VI. Band). Halle, Niemeyer, 1925.*

Professor Kolsen of Berlin is an unwearied editor of Provençal texts. After his edition of Giraut de Bornieil and his interrupted *Gedichte der Trobadors*, he has now prepared a collection of 30 hitherto unedited songs by some 23 troubadours. It includes specimens of all the more important lyric forms: 16 *cansos*, 4 *sirventes*, 4 *tensos*, 6 *partimens*. Footnotes give some variants, as well as suggestions as to the interpretation of unusual words or constructions. A short glossary and a list of proper names are added. The texts have been carefully edited, with understanding and acuteness. Unfortunately, the editor has relied, for his *apparatus criticus*, on previous reprints and copies which are not always trustworthy. He has not collated the MSS. himself, nor consulted those which have not been printed. Thus, the numerous and valuable MSS. preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale have been entirely neglected, save in so far as they happen to occur in Mahn's reprints. The latter, as is well known, are often incorrect. Professor Kolsen has also introduced at times his own emendations (distinguished usually by italics). These are not always fortunate and could have been avoided by the use of the other MSS. Moreover, some variants of the MSS. used are omitted, or are given incorrectly.

I propose to take as an example piece no. 3, a *canso* by Albert de Sestaron,<sup>1</sup> preserved in the MSS. ACEDGIKMTaf. Of these Prof. K. was able to use only ADGa. First it may be noted that his strophe order is not found in any MS. The order as found in the various MSS.<sup>2</sup> is as follows: AGIKa (1 2 3 6 5), DEMT (1 2 6 5 4), C (1 2 6 4 5). The original order was evidently: 1 2 3 6 5 4. The editor was probably induced to change it by metrical considerations. The same rimes being repeated in a different order in the first three strophes,<sup>3</sup> he evidently thought that the last three should repeat this arrangement. But the poet, by an ingenious device, rarely found among the troubadours, reverses the order, strophe IV having the same arrangement of rimes as III; V as II; and VI as I.

As to the text of this song, K. nowhere indicates his MS. base. He has apparently mainly followed D, without hesitating to introduce emendations of his own where the text seemed to require it. A comparison of the Paris MSS. indicates the following changes:

<sup>1</sup> It is No. 16, 9 of Bartsch's *Grundriss*.

<sup>2</sup> The MS. f contains only the first two strophes.

<sup>3</sup> The rime scheme is as follows: I a b b c c d e d; II d a a e e b c b; III b d d c c a e a.

v. 15: *Per merce·us prec que no m'aiatz salvatge*. *Aiatz* is an emendation of the editor. The MSS. CEIKM read: *que no·us sia salvatge*,<sup>4</sup> which is evidently correct, and which gives a different sense.

vv. 25-32. This strophe (found in D) is thus printed by the editor:

Tenez *vil* me e mas chanzos:  
 Depuis no·m voletz far nuill be,  
 Failliz que·us plevist, per ma fe,<sup>5</sup>  
 Si tot vos *etz e* bell' e d'aut lignatge.  
 Lo bes, qu'e·us voill, es egal del paratge,  
 E s'eu enanz ne·us dic vostra lausor,  
 A vos sui hom e amics e servire;  
 Ben me podetz penre per servidor.

This strophe is also found in CEMT. The MS. C presents the following reading, which is in all respects superior to that reconstituted by Kolsen:

Retenez me e mas chansos,  
 Puis no·m voletz far autre be,  
 Faiz<sup>6</sup> qu'eu vos plevisc, per ma fe.  
 Si tot vos *etz bella e* d'aut lignatge,<sup>7</sup>  
 Lo bens que·us voill es egal<sup>8</sup> lo coratge;  
 E se·us enanz ni dic vostra lausor,  
 E vos sui hom et amanz e servire,  
 Ben me podetz penre per servidor.

V. 36. *semblanz*, found in AGIKT, seems to me preferable to *plazers*, given by CDEMa and adopted by Kolsen.

V. 48. Ara sapchatz la dolor e·l martire,  
 Don ieu sui tant destreitz et enojos.

Here Kolsen changes *enveios*, found in all the MSS. without exception, to *enojos*, without indicating the emendation. The reading *enveios*, however, provides one of the antithetic paradoxes beloved by the troubadours, and should be kept: "Know now the pain and torment by which I am so afflicted and of which I am so desirous."

Moreover, K. has failed to give the following variants of the MSS. (ADGa) at his disposition: in D:<sup>9</sup> v. 1 *destreit*; v. 31 *Eu vos son*; v. 37 *E la bocha don vos vei gen rire*; v. 44 *Qui tant*

<sup>4</sup> *Salvatge* is here the neuter form, in agreement with the unexpressed subject of *sia*.

<sup>5</sup> Kolsen makes no comment on this bizarre line.

<sup>6</sup> I interrupt *faiz* as a substantive, in apposition with *me e mas chansos* of v. 25: "deeds which I dedicate to you, by my faith."

<sup>7</sup> The hiatus *bella e* is a license which many troubadours permit themselves occasionally. Cf. for example Bernart de Ventadorn (edition Appel), 8, 19 *d'ira e d'esmai*; 13, 52 *vergonha e paor*, etc.

<sup>8</sup> *Egal* is here the preposition.

<sup>9</sup> According to photographs in my possession.

*cela*. In G: <sup>10</sup> v. 18 *granz*; v. 31 *amic*; v. 43 *granz*. In a: <sup>11</sup> v. 13 *qi me faz*; v. 34 *vostre*. The following variants are incorrectly given: 8 *de* AD (*del* in both MSS.); 14 *des ienc* D (the MS. has *renc*); 43 *lantra* D (the MS. has *la tra* = *la terra*, as in the text).

Space is lacking to examine in a similar way the other pieces contained in this edition. I do not, however, wish to imply that all would show the same omissions and errors as this one.<sup>12</sup> In general, the text is well established and readable. But this example will suffice, I think, to prove that Professor Kolsen's critical apparatus cannot be trusted by scholars without recourse to the MSS. Many of the songs, moreover, are quite difficult to understand, and one would have liked more interpretation and commentary than he has seen fit to give us. A translation would in many cases have been most acceptable. But the book is useful, inasmuch as it presents, in a readable form, a number of songs not easily accessible elsewhere. As such, it deserves a hearty welcome.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD.

*Hamilton College.*

---

*The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers*, by FRED NEWTON SCOTT. Pp. vi + 345. Allyn and Bacon, New York, 1926.

In this volume Professor Scott has gathered together a number of papers contributed to learned and popular journals during the past twenty years or so. The volume is thus a miscellany; it contains papers that range from *The Accentual Structure of Isolable English Phrases* to *Carlyle's Dante* and even *A Fable of Bidpai*. Nevertheless, everything in the book can be classified either as philology or as pedagogy. In his capacity of philologist Professor Scott has a wide range, but reveals a partiality for the linguistic side. In his capacity of teacher he shows himself tolerant and objective, and interested primarily, not in methods but in results. This attitude is that of the true *magister*, of course, and one can only envy those who have had the privilege of sitting at his feet. The book makes pleasant reading, for both layman and scholar,

<sup>10</sup> According to the edition of Bertoni in the publications of the *Gesellschaft für romanische Litteratur*, Band 28, pp. 254-5.

<sup>11</sup> According to the edition of Bertoni: *Il canzoniere provenzale di Bernart Amoros* (Fribourg, 1911).

<sup>12</sup> For example, I have examined closely the piece No. 7 (Daude de Pradas, 17), and although there are to be found many minor errors in the variants, and although the MSS. CEIKMR have not been considered, there is nothing which calls for a change in the text as established by K.

and by reason of its sanity, its vision, and its trustworthiness, it has earned a place in many a well-selected library.

I find myself in almost continual agreement with Mr. Scott, as he makes his points, and so I have little to offer by way of correction or adverse comment. On p. 4 he labels *just fahncy* as Londonese. But surely no Londoner ever said *fahncy*! The pronunciation is characteristic of foreigners making mistakes in trying to learn English; I have also heard it in the mouths of Americans who thought they were speaking as the English do. A true Londoner pronounces *fancy* with a front *a*. On p. 22 Mr. Scott speaks of a *philologist* when he evidently means *linguist*. And on p. 85 I find this shocking statement: "I have read [English] literature in its whole extent from Chaucer down." How long will people keep on calling Chaucer the earliest English writer? Mr. Scott certainly knows better; he knows and enjoys *Beowulf*, of course; and yet he here falls in with the popular notion that English literature began in the fourteenth century. No wonder Miss Harriet Monroe tells us that our present-day American poets are "shaking hands with the poets of Chaucer's time and are broadcasting the idea of poetry gained when the English language was being formed from the Anglo-Saxon and French."<sup>1</sup> And with Mr. Scott's example before us we are not surprised to find a reviewer in the *New Republic*<sup>2</sup> swallowing with child-like faith the "reminder" that "French poetry is some centuries older than English." Is Old English by any chance Anglo-Saxon in Mr. Scott's nomenclature? If so, that fact would explain, though it would not justify, his apparent tendency to forget that there is such a thing as Old English literature.

KEMP MALONE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

<sup>1</sup>I quote from a news despatch in the *Baltimore Evening Sun*, May 21, 1926.

<sup>2</sup>Oct. 6, 1926, p. 200, col. 1 bottom.

# INDEX

PAGE	PAGE
Adams, E. L.: W. P. Shepard, Les Poésies de Jausbert de Puyebot . . . . . 197	Baldwin, T. W., Nathaniel Field and Robert Wilson. . . . . 32
Ælfred's Interpretation of Exo- dus xxii, 18 . . . . . 177	Ballads, German . . . . . 135
Aesthetics and Art in the <i>As- trée</i> . . . . . 211	Banks, T. H., Jr., Denham's Supposed Authorship of <i>Di- rections to a Painter</i> , 1667, . . . . . 502
Agg, J. T . . . . . 129	—, Sir John Denham and <i>Paradise Lost</i> . . . . . 51
Agrippa, Cornelius, von Net- tesheim . . . . . 178	Barba, P. A., B. J. Vos and —, German Lyrics and Ballads, from Klopstock to Modern Times. . . . . 135
Algérie, L', dans la Littérature Française . . . . . 336	Beatty, J. M., Jr., Mrs. Montagu, Churchill, and Mrs. Cheere . . . . . 384
Alpern, H., A Note on Guillen de Castro . . . . . 391	Baudelaire and the Arts. . . . . 439
Alterton, Margaret, Origins of Poe's Critical Theory . . . . . 208	Beaumont, Christophe de. . . . . 467
Altfriesisches Wörterbuch. . . . . 270	Bede and Pausanias. . . . . 535
Altrocchi, R., Scott, Manzoni, Rovani. . . . . 175	Bell, C. H., Middle High Ger- man <i>Zitarie</i> , <i>Zitterne</i> . . . . . 43
American Speech. . . . . 557	Bell, H., A Source for <i>Tartuffe</i> , 1067-1070 . . . . . 396
Amour, De l'—. . . . . 421	Bender, C. A., Another Forget- ten Novel. . . . . 319
<i>Anatomist Dissected</i> —by Lem- uel Gulliver. . . . . 330	Benedick's "Partridge Wing". . . . . 527
Apocrypha, Byron — . . . . . 129	<i>Beowulf</i> 1231. . . . . 466
Apostasy, Friedr. Schlegel's . . . . . 86	Beowulfian Shields and Spears 360
<i>Appel, L', de la route</i> , Estau- nié's. . . . . 407	Bergerat's, E., "Ramouki le casseur de pierres" . . . . . 185
Aristotelian "Catharsis". . . . . 158	<i>Berm.</i> . . . . . 125
Aronstein, P., Englische Wort- kunde . . . . . 471	Bibliographical Puzzle . . . . . 220
<i>Arraignment of Paris</i> , Peele's. . . . . 36	— Survey of the German Religious Drama . . . . . 157
Arts, Baudelaire and the — . . . . . 439	Bibliographie critique de J.-J. Rousseau . . . . . 423
<i>As You Like It</i> , Shakespeare's. . . . . 469	Blake. . . . . 169
Ashton, H., Lettres de Madame de La Fayette et de Gilles Ménage . . . . . 281	— and Browning . . . . . 464
<i>Astrée</i> of Honoré d'Urfé. . . . . 211	Blankenagel, J. C., Alfred Zim- mermann as a Source of Hauptmann's <i>Weber</i> . . . . . 242
Aurner, Nellie S., Bede and Pausanias . . . . . 535	Boas, G.: G. Chinard, Jefferson et les Idéologues. . . . . 205
Author of Two Byron Apocry- pha . . . . . 129	Bodmer and Thomson's <i>Seasons</i> 29
Authorship of <i>Directions to a Painter</i> . . . . . 502	Böckmann, P., Schillers Geistes- haltung als Bedingung seines dramatischen Schaffens. . . . . 480
— of <i>The British Grammar</i> . . . . . 388	Böhl de Arrom, Cecilia . . . . . 123
Austin, H. D., Dante Notes . . . . . 364	Boethius: Chaucer: Walton: Lydgate . . . . . 534
Baldensperger, F., Le mouve- ment des Idées dans l'Emi- gration Française. . . . . 476	Boileau and the French Clas-

	PAGE		PAGE
sical Critics in England (1660-1830).....	275	—, History as Costume in Hebbel's Dramas.....	489
Boscán's Sonnets.....	102	— P. Böckmann, Schillers Geisteshaltung als Bedingung seines dramatischen Schaf- fens.....	480
Boswell's Letters.....	71	—: Elise Dosenheimer, Das zentrale Problem in der Tra- gödie Friedrich Hebbels ...	200
Boucke, E. A., A Reply... ..	100	—: G. Stefansky, Das hellen- isch-deutsche Weltbild... ..	474
Bourget's, Paul, Early Novels.	349	<i>Canterbury Tales</i> .....	64
Bowman, E. M., The Early Nov- els of Paul Bourget.....	349	Caricature in <i>Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie</i> .....	449
Braginton, Mary V., Two Notes on Senecan Tragedy .. .	468	"Catharsis," Aristotelian....	158
Brandt, H. C. G., A German- English Dictionary .....	282	Cawley, R. R., A Chaucerian Echo in Spenser .....	313
Brant's <i>Ship of Fools</i> .....	344	Champion, P., Ronsard et son Temps .....	351
Brereton, J. L., <i>L'Allegro</i> 45-48	533	Chandler, F. W.: II. T. E. Perry, The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama.....	408
<i>British Grammar, The</i> .....	388	Chapman, C. O., <i>The Pardoner's Tale: a Mediaeval Sermon</i> ...	506
Brooks, N. C.: M. J. Rudwin, A Historical and Bibliograph- ical Survey of the German Religious Drama .....	137	Chaucer.....	534
Brown, A. C. L., Did Chrétien identify the Grail with the Mass?.....	226	— Junior.....	392
Brown, Beatrice, Robert of Gloucester's <i>Chronicle</i> and the <i>Life of St. Kenelm</i> .. .	13	— Tradition, The.....	402
Brown, J. E., The Critical Opin- ions of Samuel Johnson.....	420	Chaucerian Echo in Spenser..	313
Browning, Blake and —.....	464	Chaucer's <i>Canterbury Tales</i> ...	64
—'s <i>Epilogue to Dramatis Personae</i> .....	213	—'s <i>Corones Two</i> .....	317
Brusendorff, A., The Chaucer Tradition .....	402	—'s <i>Pardoner's Tale</i> .....	506
Buchanan's <i>British Grammar</i> ..	388	—'s <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> ....	537
Buckhurst, Helen M., Element- ary Grammar of Old Icelandic,	59	Chaulieu, Abbé de.....	105
Bücher des Mittelalters .. .	545	Cheere, Mrs.....	384
Bugbee, Lucy M., An Explana- tory Course in General Lan- guage.....	553	Chinard, G., Jefferson et les Idéologues.....	205
Bullock, W. L., Italian Six- teenth-Century Criticism ..	254	—: F. Baldensperger, Le mouvement des Idées dans l'Emigration Française.....	476
— R. C. Williams, The Mer- veilleux in the Epic .....	550	—: E. Malakis, French Trav- ellers in Greece (1770-1820)	410
Bush, J. N. D., Two Poems by Henry Reynolds.....	510	—: R. A. Rice, Rousseau and the Poetry of Nature in 18th Century France.....	418
Bussom, T. W., Mme de Sévigné and La Fontaine.....	239	—: C. Tailliar, L'Algérie dans la Littérature Fran- çaise .....	336
Byron Apocrypha.....	129	—: F. Vézinet, Autour de Voltaire.....	352
		— and Destutt de Tracy, De l'Amour.....	421
Campbell, K.: Margaret Alter- ton, Origins of Poe's Critical Theory.....	208	Chrétien, Did — identify the Grail with the Mass?.....	226
Campbell, T. M., Friedrich Schlegel's Apostasy and the <i>Europa</i> .....	86	—, Wolfram and —.....	520
		<i>Chryseide et Arimant</i> , Mairet's,	348
		Churchill.....	384



	PAGE		PAGE
Churchill's <i>Duel</i> .....	73	Daniel's, Samuel, <i>Civile Wars</i> ..	48
<i>Civile Wars</i> , Samuel Daniel's..	48	Dante Notes.....	364
Clark, Eleanor G., <i>Titus and</i> <i>Vespasian</i> .....	523	—'s Conception of Justice..	268
Clarke, A. F. B., Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830)..	275	<i>de</i> before <i>endront</i> in O. F.....	181
Classical Critics, French — ..	275	Definition of Criticism.....	536
— Sources, Spenser's ..	323	Delpit, Louise, Paris-Théâtre Contemporain ..	277
Coffman, Bertha R., A Note on Hagedorn's and Haller's Ger- man-English Relations.....	387	Denham, Sir John. ....	51
Coindreau, M. E.: Louise Del- pit, Paris-Théâtre Contempo- rain ..	277	—'s Supposed Authorship of <i>Directions to a Painter</i> ..	502
Comédie italienne. ....	142	Dialect, West Midland — ..	454
Comedy and Conscience ..	332	<i>Drana</i> , Montemayor's ..	251
Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama .....	408	Dictionary, Etymological —, English ..	334
<i>Commedia dell' arte</i> .....	516	—, German-English.....	282
Comparative, <i>the</i> with —.....	300	— cf. Wörterbuch. ....	204, 270
Conscience, Comedy and —.....	332	Dictionnaire de la Langue Fran- çaise du Seizième Siècle.....	339
Cook, A. S., Hellenic and Beo- wulfian Shields and Spears .	360	Dilemma, Scott's.....	45
—, and C. B. Tinker, Trans- lations from Old English Poetry.....	488	Diplomatic Language.....	140
Cooper, C. B., <i>Titinnabulation</i>	318	<i>Directions to a Painter</i> ..	502
<i>Copus</i> .....	125	Ditchy, J. K.: G. Girard, La Jeunesse d'Anatole France; M. Corday, Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France ..	334
Corday, M., Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France .	334	Don Carlos ..	194
<i>Corones Two</i> .....	317	Donne ..	264
Covington, F. F., Jr., An Early 17th Century Criticism of Spenser ..	386	<i>Doppelgänger</i> , Heine's ..	115
Crane, T. F., <i>Liber de Miraculis</i> <i>Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie</i>	340	Dosenheimer, Elise, Das zen- trale Problem in der Tragö- die Friedrich Hebbels....	200
—: J. Koch, Geoffrey Chau- cers Canterbury-Erzählungen	64	Dragon, Spenser's.....	143
—: F. von der Leyen, <i>Bücher</i> <i>des Mittelalters</i> .....	545	Drama, German Religious —.....	137
Crawford, J. P. W., Notes on Three Sonnets of Boscán ..	102	—, Restoration —.....	408
Crestien, Wolfram and — ..	520	Dramas, Hebbel's.....	489
Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson.....	420	<i>Dramatis Personae</i> , Browning's	213
— Theory, Poe's.....	208	Draper, J. W., More Light on Spenser's Linguistics.....	127
Criticism, Definition of.....	536	—: J. W. Krutch, Comedy and Conscience after the Reformation.....	332
—, Italian Sixteenth-Cen- tury —.....	254	Drayton and Shakespeare..	248
— of Spenser ..	386	Dryness, Spiritual —.....	411
Critics, French Classical —.....	275	Duchartre, P. L., La Comédie italienne ..	142
Crux in the <i>Peterborough Chron-</i> <i>icle</i> .....	170	Duclaux, Mary, Life of Racine	487
Dancourt a Plagiarist?.....	34	Duels, Otway's.....	73
		Dumbabin, R. L., A Rhetorical Figure in Shakespeare.....	469
		Eddy, W. A., <i>The Anatomist</i> <i>Dissected</i> —by Lemuel Gulli- ver. ....	330
		Elizabeth, Queen, and Bene- dick's "Partridge Wing"....	527

	PAGE		PAGE
Elizabethan Players as Trades- folk . . . . .	363	Frank, Grace: T. F. Crane, Li- ber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie . . . . .	340
Emerson, O. F., A New Word and a New Meaning. . . . .	125	French, J. C.: K. B. Muddock, Increase Mather . . . . .	419
—, The Crux in the <i>Peter- borough Chronicle</i> . . . . .	170	—, E. Weekley, A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. . . . .	334
Emigration Française . . . . .	476	French Classical Critics. . . . .	275
<i>endroit</i> in O. F. . . . .	181	— Emigration. . . . .	476
England, Eighteenth Century —	132	— Grammar. . . . .	482
—, Medieval Romance in —. . . . .	446	— Language. . . . .	140, 339
Englische Wortkunde . . . . .	471	— Literature . . . . .	336
English Etymological Dictionary	334	— Theatre. . . . .	401
— Language . . . . .	553	— Travellets in Greece. . . . .	410
— Versions of <i>The Ship of Fools</i> . . . . .	344	Frenken, G., Wunder und Taten der Heiligen . . . . .	545
—, German-English Rela- tions. . . . .	387	Fugenvokal in westgerman- ischen Kompositis. . . . .	188
Epic . . . . .	550	<i>Fulgens and Lucre</i> s. . . . .	97
<i>Epilogue to Dramatis Personae</i>	213	Gateway to English. . . . .	553
Epitaphes, Les, de Ronsard . . . . .	60	Gehalt und Form . . . . .	417
Essays of Montaigne. . . . .	414	<i>Genesis</i> , altsächsisch. . . . .	204
Estauné, E., <i>L'Appel de la route</i> . . . . .	407	German-English Dictionary. . . . .	282
Etudes sur le théâtre français et italien . . . . .	401	— Relations . . . . .	387
Etymological Dictionary, Eng- lish . . . . .	334	German Literature. . . . .	483
Etymologies, Old Norse . . . . .	370	— Lyrics and Ballads . . . . .	135
<i>Euphuus</i> , Lyly's . . . . .	1	— Religious Drama. . . . .	137
<i>Europa</i> , Friedr. Schlegel's. . . . .	86	Gesprache mit Heine . . . . .	279
Explanatory Course in General Language . . . . .	553	Gilbert, A. H., Dante's Concep- tion of Justice. . . . .	268
Exodus xxii, 18. . . . .	177	—, A Source of Peele's <i>Ar- raignment of Paris</i> . . . . .	36
Fable of the Bees . . . . .	341	—: Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne by Mem- bers of the English Depart- ment of the Univ. of Michi- gan. . . . .	264
Fairchild, H. N., 'Leyde here legges alui' . . . . .	378	Girard, G., <i>La Jeunesse d'Ana- tole France</i> . . . . .	334
Farnham, W., <i>The Merchants Tale</i> in Chaucer Junior. . . . .	392	Glatigny, Albert: A Study in Literary Relationships. . . . .	164
<i>Faust</i> , 4203-4205. . . . .	107	Goddard, Eunice R.: C. Guillet, An Oral French Grammar. . . . .	482
Faust, A. B.: R. Petsch, <i>Gehalt und Form</i> . . . . .	417	Goethe's <i>Faust</i> , 4203-4205. . . . .	107
—, Studies in German Liter- ature in Honor of A. R. Hohl- feld. . . . .	483	— <i>Wilhelm Meisters Lehr- jahre</i> . . . . .	513
Faverty, F. E., <i>The Rolls of Parliament and the New Eng- lish Dictionary</i> . . . . .	375	Gordon, E. V., and J. R. R. Tolkien, <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> . . . . .	397
<i>Fée aux Miettes</i> . . . . .	346	Gothic Infinitive <i>haben</i> . . . . .	382
Field, Nathaniel. . . . .	32	Graham, W., Scott's Dilemma . . . . .	45
Flaubert, Unwritten Works of — . . . . .	24	Grail and the Mass. . . . .	226
Forgotten Novel. . . . .	319	Grammar, French. . . . .	482
Français, Le, <i>Langue Diplo- matique</i> . . . . .	140	—, Middle English. . . . .	400
France, Anatole. . . . .	334		

PAGE	PAGE
—, Old Icelandic . . . . . 59	—: C. B. Tinker, Letters of James Boswell . . . . . 71
Grandgent, C. H.: A. H. Gilbert, Dante's Conception of Justice . . . . . 268	Hay's, John, <i>The Money-Makers</i> . . . . . 319
Greece, French Travellers in—, 410	Hazard, P.: Destutt de Tracy and G. Chénard, <i>De l'Amour</i> . . . . . 421
Greenlaw, E., Two Notes on Spenser's Classical Sources . . . . . 323	Hebbel, Friedrich . . . . . 200
—: Bernard Mandeville, <i>The Fable of the Bees</i> , ed. by F. B. Kaye . . . . . 341	—'s Dramas . . . . . 489
—: Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies . . . . . 271	Hebel, J. W., Drayton and Shakespeare . . . . . 248
Grimald, Nicholas . . . . . 202	Hegge Plays . . . . . 530
Guillen de Castro . . . . . 391	Heine . . . . . 279
Guillet, C., An Oral French Grammar . . . . . 482	—'s <i>Doppelgänger</i> . . . . . 115
Guilloton, V., 'Il est pourtant temps, comme dit la chanson' . . . . . 40	<i>Heliant</i> . Wörterbuch zum —. . . . . 204
Gulliver's, Lemuel, <i>Anatomist Dissected</i> . . . . . 330	Hellenic and Beowulfian Shields and Spears . . . . . 360
Hagedorn and Haller . . . . . 387	Hellenisch-deutsches Weltbild . . . . . 474
Haller, Hagedorn and — . . . . . 387	Heller, E. K., Wolfram's Relationship to the Crestien MSS . . . . . 520
Ham, R. G., Otway's Duels with Churchill and Settle . . . . . 73	Henry, Marjorie L., <i>L'Appel de la route</i> , par E. Estaunié . . . . . 407
Hammond, Eleanor P.: Boethius: Chaucer: Walton: Lydgate . . . . . 534	Herrick, M. T., Joseph Trapp and the Aristotelian "Catharsis" . . . . . 158
Handbuch der mittellenglischen Grammatik . . . . . 400	Hespelt, E. H., A Second Pseudonym of Cecilia Böhl de Arrom . . . . . 123
<i>Handful of Pleasant Delights</i> . . . . . 327	Hibbard, Laura A., Medieval Romance in England . . . . . 406
Hanford, J. H.: Denis Saurat, Milton, Man and Thinker . . . . . 55	"Hippocrates' Twins" . . . . . 50
Harrison, T. P., Jr., Concerning <i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> and Montemayor's <i>Diana</i> . . . . . 251	Historia de la Literatura Española . . . . . 486
Hartman, H., The Home of the <i>Ludus Coventriae</i> . . . . . 530	Historical and Bibliographical Survey of the German Religious Drama . . . . . 137
Hatfield, J. T.: B. J. Vos and P. A. Barba, German Lyrics and Ballads, from Klopstock to Modern Times . . . . . 135	History as Costume in Hebbel's Dramas . . . . . 489
Hauptmann's <i>Weber</i> . . . . . 242	Hohlfeld, A. R., Studies in Honor of — . . . . . 483
Havens, R. D., Blake and Browning . . . . . 464	Holmes, U. T., Villon's <i>Testament</i> , Line 1194 . . . . . 116
—, William Somervile's Earliest Poem . . . . . 80	—: <i>Mélanges de Philologie</i> , offerts à M. Johan Vising . . . . . 138
—: J. E. Brown, The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson . . . . . 420	Holthausen, F., <i>Altfrisisches Wörterbuch</i> . . . . . 270
—: Elizabeth W. Manwaring, Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England . . . . . 132	Home of the <i>Ludus Coventriae</i> . . . . . 530
—: P. Merriitt, Piozzi Marginalia . . . . . 212	Houben, H. H., <i>Gesprache mit Heine</i> . . . . . 279
	Huguet, E., <i>Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizième Siècle</i> . . . . . 339
	Hugo, Victor, and Horace Walpole . . . . . 458
	Hurtado, J., y A. G. Palencia, <i>Historia de la Literatura Española</i> . . . . . 486

	PAGE		PAGE
Ibershoff, C. H., Bodmer and Thomson's <i>Seasons</i> . . . . .	29	Koch, J., Chaucers Canterbury-Erzählungen . . . . .	64
Icelandic Grammar . . . . .	59	Kolsen, A., Trobadorgedichte . . . . .	555
Idéologues, Jefferson et les — . . . . .	205	Komposita, westgermanische . . . . .	188
'Il est pourtant temps, comme dit la chanson' . . . . .	40	Krumpelmann, J. T., Goethe's <i>Faust</i> , 4203-4205 . . . . .	107
<i>Immensee</i> . . . . .	513	Krutch, J. W., Comedy and Conscience after the Reformation . . . . .	332
Imperative Use of the Gothic Infinitive <i>haban</i> in Luke ix, 3 . . . . .	382	Kuhl, E.: A. Brunsdorff, The Chaucer Tradition . . . . .	402
Infinitive <i>haban</i> . . . . .	382	Kurilmeyer, W.: H. G. G. Brandt, A German-English Dictionary . . . . .	282
<i>In Memoriam</i> Stanza . . . . .	531	—: <i>Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft</i> , Bd. 3-5 . . . . .	347
Interlude . . . . .	97	La Fayette, Mme de . . . . .	281
Interpretation of Exodus xxii, 18 . . . . .	177	La Fontaine . . . . .	239
Irving's, W., Knickerbocker <i>History of New York</i> . . . . .	353	<i>L'Allegro</i> , 15-48 . . . . .	533
Italian Comedy . . . . .	142	Lancaster, H. C., <i>Chryseide et Arimant</i> , Tragi-comédie de Jean Mairet (1625) . . . . .	348
— Landscape . . . . .	132	—, <i>Toutes for Tous</i> . . . . .	470
— Sixteenth-Century Criticism . . . . .	254	—: P. Champion, Ronsard et son Temps . . . . .	351
— Theatre . . . . .	401	—: Mary Duclaux, The Life of Racine . . . . .	487
Ives, G. B., and Grace Norton, The Essays of Montaigne . . . . .	414	—: Marjorie L. Henry, <i>L'Appel de la route</i> , par E. Estaunié . . . . .	407
Jausbert de Puycibot . . . . .	197	—: E. Huguet, Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizième Siècle . . . . .	339
Jefferson et les Idéologues . . . . .	205	Landscape, Italian . . . . .	132
Jeunesse, La, d'Ernest Renan . . . . .	273	Language, Diplomatic . . . . .	140
Johnson, Samuel . . . . .	420	—, French . . . . .	339
Johnston, O. M., Use of <i>de</i> before <i>endroit</i> in Old French . . . . .	181	Lasserre, P., La Jeunesse d'Ernest Renan . . . . .	273
Jones, H. M., The Author of Two Byron Apocrypha . . . . .	129	Lathrop, H. B., The Translations of John Tiptoft . . . . .	496
Jordan, R., Handbuch der mittelenglischen Grammatik . . . . .	400	Laumonier, P.: Margaret de Schweinitz, Les Epitaphes de Ronsard . . . . .	60
Journal of Mediaeval Studies . . . . .	271	Lawrence, W. J., Elizabethan Players as Tradesfolk . . . . .	363
Judson, A. C., Cornelius Agrippa and Henry Vaughan . . . . .	178	Lemmi, C. W., Monster-spawning Nile-mud in Spenser . . . . .	234
<i>Julius Caesar</i> and Ovid . . . . .	172	Letters of James Boswell . . . . .	71
Justice, Dante's Conception of — . . . . .	268	Lettres de Mme de La Fayette et de Gilles Ménage . . . . .	281
Kaye, F. B., Mandeville's <i>Fable of the Bees</i> . . . . .	341	Levi, Ezio, Il Principe Don Carlos nella Leggenda e nella Poesia . . . . .	194
Kemp, Will, and The <i>Commedia dell' arte</i> . . . . .	516	'Leyde here legges aliri' . . . . .	378
Kennedy, A. G., Authorship of <i>The British Grammar</i> . . . . .	388		
<i>King John</i> , Shakespeare's . . . . .	535		
Kirkeconnell, W., The <i>Epilogue to Dramatis Personae</i> . . . . .	213		
Kleist-Gesellschaft . . . . .	347		
Klopstock . . . . .	135		
Knickerbocker <i>History of New York</i> . . . . .	353		

	PAGE
Liber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie . . . .	340
Lieder, F. W. C.: Ezio Levi, Il Principe Don Carlos nella Leggenda e nella Poesia..	194
Life of Racine.. . . .	487
Life of St. Kenelm.....	13
Light on Spenser's Linguistics	127
Liljegen, S. B., Heine's <i>Doppelgänger</i> . . . . .	115
Linguistics, Spenser's . . . .	127
Literary Relationships . . .	164
Literature, French.. . . .	336
—, German . . . . .	483
—, Spanish . . . . .	486
"Lucy" Poems. . . . .	314
Ludwig, Otto, Nature in— . .	8
<i>Lulus Coventryae</i> . . . . .	530
Lydgate. . . . .	534
Lyly's <i>Euphuus</i> . . . . .	1
—'s <i>Midas</i> . . . . .	193
Lyrics, German . . . . .	135
Mackenzie, W. R., "Standing Water". . . . .	283
Madeleva, Sister M., <i>Pearl: A Study in Spiritual Dryness</i> . 411	
Mairet's <i>Chryséide et Arimant</i>	348
Malakis, E., French Travellers in Greece (1770-1820) . .	410
Malone, K., A Note on <i>Beowulf</i> 1231. . . . .	466
—: P. Aronstein, <i>Englische Wortkunde</i> . . . . .	471
—: Helen M. Buckhurst, <i>An Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic</i> . . . . .	59
—: Lucy M. Bugbee, <i>An Explanatory Course in General Language</i> ; H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins, <i>The Gateway to English</i> .....	553
—: A. S. Cook and C. B. Tinker, <i>Translations from Old English Poetry</i> . . . . .	488
—: Laura A. Hubbard, <i>Medieval Romance in England</i> . 406	
—: R. Jordan, <i>Handbuch der mittelenglischen Grammatik</i>	400
—: F. N. Scott, <i>The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers</i> .. . . .	557
Mandeville, B., <i>Fable of the Bees</i> . . . . .	341
Manwaring, Elizabeth W., <i>Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England</i> .....	132

	PAGE
Manzoni.....	175
Märchen, Fabeln und Schwänke	546
Mass, Grail and the —. . . .	226
Mather, Increase.. . . .	419
Maynadier, G. H.: M. E. Speare, The Political Novel: Its Development in England and America.. . . .	134
McDowell, G. T., General James Wilkinson in the Knickerbocker <i>History of New York</i> ,	353
McKeehan, Irene P., A Neglected Example of the <i>In Memoriam Stanza</i> .....	531
McMahon, Mary C., Aesthetics and Art in the <i>Astrée</i> of Honoré d'Urfé.. . . .	211
Mediæval Romance. . . . .	406
— Sermon.....	506
— Studies.....	271
— Tales.....	545
Mélanges de Philologie, offerts à M. Johan Vising . . . .	138
Ménage, Gilles.. . . .	281
Menner, R. J., Four Notes on the West Midland Dialect..	454
—: Sister M. Madeleva, <i>Pearl: A Study in Spiritual Dryness</i> .....	411
—: J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> . . . . .	397
<i>Merchant's Tale</i> in Chaucer Junior. . . . .	392
Merrill, L. R., <i>The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald</i> . 202	
Merritt, P., <i>Piozzi Marginalia</i> . 212	
Merveilleux in the Epic . . . .	550
Michigan, English Dept. of Univ. of —. . . . .	264
<i>Midas</i> , John Lyly's . . . . .	193
Middle English Grammar.. .	400
Middle High German <i>Zitarie</i> , <i>Zitterie</i> , . . . . .	43
<i>Midnights Meditations</i> (1646)	220
Mignon, M., <i>Etudes sur le théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance</i> . . . . .	401
Milton . . . . .	55, 264
Milton's <i>L'Allegro</i> .....	533
— "Old Damoetas".....	293
— <i>Paradise Lost</i> .....	51
— Popularity in 18th Century . . . . .	322
Molière's <i>Tartuffe</i> .....	396
<i>Monde, Le, où l'on s'ennuie</i> ..	449

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Money-Makers</i> , John Hay's..	319	— on Tieck's Early Romanti-	
Monster-Spawning Nile-mud in		cism .....	444
Spenser ..	234	Notes, Dante —...	364
Montague, Mrs., Churchill, and		— on Blake ..	169
Mrs. Cheere .....	384	— on <i>Fulgens and Lucre</i> s ..	97
Montaigne .....	209	— on Senecan Tragedy..	468
—'s Essays .....	414	— on Spenser's Classical	
Montemayor's <i>Diana</i> ..	251	Sources .....	323
Moore, C. A., <i>Midnight's Medi-</i>		— on the West Midland Dia-	
<i>tations</i> (1646). A Biblio-		lect .....	454
graphical Puzzle .....	220	— on Three Sonnets of Bos-	
Morley, S. G., A Note on the		cán .....	102
Spanish Octosyllable... ..	182	— on Voltaire .....	118
Mott, L. F., Sainte-Beuve ..	67	Novel, Forgotten —...	319
Mouvement, Le, des Idées dans		—, Political .....	134
l'Émigration Française ..	476	Novels, Early, of Paul Bourget,	349
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> ..	527	Noyes, E. S., A Note on <i>Pere-</i>	
Murdock, K. B., Increase		<i>grine Pickle</i> and <i>Pygmalion</i> ,	327
Mather .....	419		
Mustard, W. P., "Hippocrates"			
Twins," .....	50	Octosyllable, Spanish .....	182
—, Note on John Lyly's		"Of-or" Construction .....	462
<i>Midas</i> .....	193	'Old Damocetas," Milton's ..	293
— L. R. Merrill, The Life		Old English Poetry .....	488
and Poems of Nicholas Gri-		Old French <i>de</i> before <i>endroit</i> ..	181
malld ..	202	Old Icelandic Grammar .....	59
		Old Norse Etymologies .....	370
		Oral French Grammar .....	482
Nature in Otto Ludwig ..	8	Origins of Poe's Critical	
—, Poetry of —.....	418	Theory .....	208
Neglected Example of the <i>In</i>		Otway's Duels .....	73
<i>Memoriam</i> Stanza..	531	Ovid .....	172
— 16th century "of-or"			
Construction .....	462	Padelford, F. M.: Fr. A. Pom-	
— Verse .....	105	pen, The English Versions of	
Nettesheim, Agrippa von....	178	<i>The Ship of Fools</i> .....	344
<i>New English Dictionary</i> .....	375	Pailleron's <i>Le Monde où l'on</i>	
New Word and a New Mean-		<i>s'ennuie</i> .....	440
ing ..	125	Palencia, A. G., J. Hurtado y—,	
Nicolson, Marjorie H., Milton's		Historia de la Literatura	
"Old Damocetas," .....	293	Española .....	486
Nile-mud, Monster-spawning.	234	<i>Paradise Lost</i> .....	51
Norton, Grace, G. B. Ives and		<i>Pardoner's Tale</i> a Mediaeval	
—, The Essays of Montaigne,	414	Sermon .....	506
Note on <i>Beowulf</i> 1231 .....	466	Paris-Théâtre Contemporain... ..	277
— on <i>Corones Two</i> .....	317	Parker, R. E., A Note on <i>Coro-</i>	
— on Guillen de Castro... ..	391	<i>nes Two</i> .....	317
— on Hagedorn and Haller, ..	387	Parody of <i>Euphu</i> s .....	1
— on John Lyly's <i>Midas</i> ..	193	"Partridge Wing," Benedick's ..	257
— on <i>Peregrine Pickle</i> and		Pater-Saintsbury Definition of	
<i>Pygmalion</i> .....	327	Criticism .....	536
— on Samuel Daniel's <i>Civile</i>		Patzner, O., Unwritten Works of	
<i>Wars</i> ..	48	Flaubert .....	24
— on Shakespeare's <i>King</i>		Pausanias .....	535
<i>John</i> ..	535	<i>Pearl</i> : A Study in Spiritual	
— on the Spanish Octosyl-		Dryness .....	411
lable ..	182		

	PAGE		PAGE
Peele's <i>Arraignment of Paris</i> . . . . .	36	Rice, G. A., Rousseau and the Poetry of Nature in 18th Century France . . . . .	418
Pennington, W., The "Lucy" Poems . . . . .	314	Robert of Gloucester's <i>Chronicle</i> . . . . .	13
<i>Peregrine Pickle and Pygmalion</i> . . . . .	327	Roberts, J. H., A Note on Samuel Daniel's <i>Civile Wars</i> . . . . .	48
Perry, H. T. E., The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama, <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> . . . . .	408	Robles, J. J. Hurtado y A. G. Palencia, <i>Historia de la Literatura Española</i> . . . . .	486
Petsch, R., Gehalt und Form. . . . .	417	Rollins, H. E., <i>A Handful of Pleasant Delights</i> . . . . .	327
Philologie, <i>Mélanges de</i> — . . . . .	138	Rolls of Parliament and the <i>NED</i> . . . . .	375
Pierce, F. E., Two Notes on Blake . . . . .	169	Romance, Medieval . . . . .	406
<i>Piers Plouman</i> . . . . .	378	Romanticism, Tieck's Early —, <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . . .	1
Pillionnel, J. H., Voltaire et Christophe de Beaumont . . . . .	467	Ronsard et son Temps —'s Epitaphes . . . . .	351 60
Piozzi Marginalia . . . . .	212	Root, R. K., The Book of <i>Trivius and Criseyde</i> , by Geoffrey Chaucer . . . . .	537
Plagiarist . . . . .	34	Rousseau and Poetry of Nature —, <i>Bibliographie de</i> — . . . . .	418 423
Players, Elizabethan . . . . .	363	Rovani . . . . .	175
Poem, Somervile's Earliest —, Poems by Henry Reynolds . . . . .	80 510	Rudwin, M. J., A Historical and Bibliographical Survey of the German Religious Drama . . . . .	137
Poe's Critical Theory . . . . .	208	Sagen und Geschichten aus dem alten Frankreich und England . . . . .	545
Poetry of Nature —, Old English . . . . .	418 488	Sainte-Beuve . . . . .	67
Political Novel . . . . .	134	Saintsbury's <i>History of Criticism</i> . . . . .	536
Pompen, F. A., The English Versions of <i>The Ship of Fools</i> . . . . .	344	Sandison, Helen, The Unblemished Garments in <i>The Tempest</i> . . . . .	44
Porterfield, A. W., <i>Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre and Im-mensee</i> . . . . .	513	Saurat, D., Milton, Man and Thinker . . . . .	55
Post, L. A., Note on Shakespeare's <i>King John</i> . . . . .	535	Schaffer, A., Albert Glatigny: A Study in Literary Relationships . . . . .	164
Problem in der Tragödie Hebbels . . . . .	200	Schillers Geisteshaltung als Bedingung seines dramatischen Schaffens. . . . .	480
Pseudonym, Second, of Cecilia Bohl de Arrom . . . . .	123	Schinz, A., <i>Bibliographie critique de J.-J. Rousseau dans les cinq dernières années</i> . . . . .	423
<i>Pygmalion, Peregrine Pickle and</i> — . . . . .	327	—: Mary C McMahon, <i>Aesthetics and Art in the Astrée of Honoré d'Urfé</i> . . . . .	211
Question of Personal Caricature in <i>Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie</i> , . . . . .	449	—: J. B. Scott, <i>Le Français, Langue Diplomatique Moderne</i> . . . . .	140
Racine, Life of . . . . .	487		
"Ramouki le casseur de pierres," . . . . .	185		
Ranke, F., <i>Tristan und Isold</i> . . . . .	546		
Relationships, Literary . . . . .	164		
Religious Drama, German . . . . .	137		
Renaissance Theatre . . . . .	401		
Renan, Ernest . . . . .	273		
Reply . . . . .	100		
Restoration Drama . . . . .	408		
Reynolds, Henry . . . . .	510		
Rhetorical Figure in Shakespeare . . . . .	469		
Richards, A. E., Milton's Popularity in the 18th Century, . . . . .	322		

PAGE	PAGE
Schlegel's, Friedrich, Apostasy and the <i>Europa</i> . . . . .	86
Schlutier, O. B., King Ælfred's Interpretation of Exodus xxii, 18 . . . . .	177
Schneider, F.: H. H. Houben, Gespräche mit Heine . . . . .	279
Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft . . . . .	347
Schwartz, W. L., E. Bergerat's "Ramonki le casseur de pierres," . . . . .	185
—, The Question of Personal Caricature in <i>Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie</i> . . . . .	449
Schwartzkopf, Werner, und Maja, Sagen und Geschichten aus dem alten Frankreich und England . . . . .	545
Schweinitz, Margaret de, Les Epitaphes de Ronsard . . . . .	60
Scott, F. N., The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers . . . . .	557
Scott, J. B., Le Français, Langue Diplomatique Moderne . . . . .	140
Scott, Manzoni, Rovani . . . . .	175
—'s Dilemma . . . . .	45
Searles, C.: H. C. Lancaster, <i>Chryséide et Arimant</i> , Tragédie comédie de Jean Mairet (1625) . . . . .	348
<i>Seasons</i> , Thomson's . . . . .	29
Schrt, E. H., Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum <i>Hehand</i> und zur alts. <i>Genesis</i> . . . . .	204
—: F. Holthausen, Altfriesisches Wörterbuch . . . . .	270
Senecan Tragedy . . . . .	468
Settle's Duel . . . . .	73
Sévigné, Mme de — and La Fontaine . . . . .	239
Shackford, Martha H., <i>Julius Cæsar</i> and Ovid . . . . .	172
Shakespeare . . . . .	264
—, Drayton and — . . . . .	248
—'s <i>As You Like It</i> . . . . .	469
—'s Debt to Montaigne . . . . .	209
—'s <i>Julius Cæsar</i> . . . . .	172
—'s <i>King John</i> . . . . .	535
—'s <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> . . . . .	527
—'s <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . . .	1
—'s <i>Tempest</i> . . . . .	44
—'s <i>Titus Andronicus</i> . . . . .	523
—'s <i>Twelfth Night</i> . . . . .	283
—'s <i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> . . . . .	251
Shanks, L. P., Beaudelaire and the Arts . . . . .	439
—: J. Vodoz, <i>La Fée aux Miettes</i> . . . . .	346
Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i> . . . . .	327
Shepard, W. P., Les Poésies de Jausbert de Puycibot . . . . .	197
—: A. Kolsen, Trobadorgedichte . . . . .	555
Shields and Spears . . . . .	360
<i>Ship of Fools</i> . . . . .	344
Shumway, D. B.: E. H. Schrt, Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum <i>Hehand</i> und zur alts. <i>Genesis</i> . . . . .	204
Silz, W., Nature in the Tales of Otto Ludwig . . . . .	8
<i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> . . . . .	397
Small G, W., The Syntax of the with the Comparative . . . . .	300
Smith, H. E., Horace Walpole anticipates Victor Hugo . . . . .	458
—: P. Lasserre, <i>La Jeunesse d'Ernest Renan</i> . . . . .	273
—: L. F. Mott, <i>Sainte-Beuve</i> , . . . . .	67
Smith, Winifred: P. L. Duchartre, <i>La Comédie italienne</i> . . . . .	142
—: M. Mignon, <i>Etudes sur le théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance</i> . . . . .	401
Smollett's <i>Peregrine Pickle</i> . . . . .	327
Somerville's, William, Earliest Poem . . . . .	280
Sonnets of Boscán . . . . .	102
Sorber, J. D.: E. M. Bowman, Early Novels of Paul Bourget . . . . .	349
Source for <i>Tartuffe</i> , 1067-1070 . . . . .	396
— of Hauptmann's <i>Weber</i> . . . . .	242
— of Peele's <i>Arraignment of Paris</i> . . . . .	36
Spanish Literature . . . . .	486
— Octosyllable . . . . .	182
Spere, M. E., The Political Novel: Its Development in England and America . . . . .	134
Spears, Shields and — . . . . .	360
Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies . . . . .	271
Speech, American . . . . .	557
Spenser . . . . .	234
—, Chaucer and — . . . . .	313



	PAGE		PAGE
—, Criticism of . . . . .	386	—, A Parody of <i>Euphues</i> in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . . .	1
—'s Classical Sources . . . . .	323	Tinker, C. B., Letters of James Boswell . . . . .	71
—'s Diagon . . . . .	143	—, A. S. Cook and —, Trans- lations from Old English Poetry . . . . .	488
—'s Linguistics . . . . .	127	Tintinnabulation . . . . .	318
Spiritual Dryness . . . . .	411	Tiptoft, John . . . . .	496
Standard of American Speech . .	557	<i>Titus and Vespasian</i> . . . . .	523
"Standing Water" . . . . .	283	<i>Titus Andronicus</i> . . . . .	523
Stefansky, G., Das hellenisch- deutsche Weltbild . . . . .	474	Tolkien, J. R. R., and E. V. Gor- don, <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> . . . . .	397
Stenberg, T., The Pater-Saints- bury Definition of Criticism .	536	<i>Toutes for Tous</i> . . . . .	470
Storm's <i>Immensee</i> . . . . .	513	Tracy, Destutt de, and G. Chi- nard, <i>De l'Amour</i> . . . . .	421
Studies in German Literature in Honor of A. R. Hohlfeld .	483	Tragedy, Senecan . . . . .	468
— in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne . . . . .	264	Tragödie, Hebbels . . . . .	200
Study in Literary Relation- ships . . . . .	164	Translations from O. E. Poetry .	488
Sturtevant, A. M., Some Old Noise Etymologies . . . . .	370	— of John Tiptoft . . . . .	496
— The Imperative Use of the Gothic Infinitive <i>haban</i> in Luke IX, 3 . . . . .	382	Trapp, J., and the Aristotelian "Catharsis," . . . . .	158
—, Zum Fugenvokal in west- germanischen Kompositis . .	188	Treble, H. A., and G. H. Val- lins, <i>The Gateway to English</i>	553
Survey of German Religious Drama . . . . .	137	<i>Tristan und Isolde</i> . . . . .	546
Syntax of <i>the</i> with the Com- parative . . . . .	300	<i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> , Chaucer's .	537
Tailliant, C., <i>L'Algérie dans la Littérature Française</i> . . . .	336	Tupper, J. W.: G. C. Taylor, Shakspeare's Debt to Mon- taigne . . . . .	209
<i>Tartuffe</i> , 1067-1070 . . . . .	396	<i>Twelfth Night</i> . . . . .	283
Taylor, G. C., Shakspeare's Debt to Montaigne . . . . .	209	<i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> and Montemayor's <i>Diana</i> . . . . .	251
—: G. B. Ives and Grace Norton, <i>The Essays of Mon- taigne</i> . . . . .	414	Unblemished Garments in <i>The Tempest</i> . . . . .	44
Tegethoff, E., Märchen, Fabeln und Schwänke . . . . .	546	Unwritten Works of Flaubert, 24 Urfé, Honoré d' . . . . .	211
<i>Tempest</i> , Shakespeare's . . . .	44	Vallins, G. H., and H. A. Treble, <i>The Gateway to English</i> . . .	553
Temple, Maud E.: H. Ashton, Letters de Madame de La Fayette et de Gilles Ménage .	281	Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Ne- glected Verse by the Abbé de Chaulieu . . . . .	105
Tennyson's <i>In Memoriam</i> . . . .	531	Vaughan, Henry . . . . .	178
<i>Testament</i> , Villon's, 1194 . . .	116	Verse, Neglected . . . . .	105
Thaler, A., Queen Elizabeth and Benedick's "Partridge Wing," <i>the</i> with the Comparative . . .	527	Vézinet, F., <i>Autour de Voltaire</i> , 352 Villon's <i>Testament</i> , 1194 . . .	116
Theatre, French and Italian . .	401	Vising, Johan . . . . .	138
Théâtre Contemporain . . . . .	277	Vodoz, J., <i>La Fée aux Miettes</i> . 346 Voltaire . . . . .	352
Theory, Poe's Critical — . . . .	208	— et Christophe de Beau- mont . . . . .	467
Thomson's <i>Seasons</i> . . . . .	29	—, Notes on — . . . . .	118
Tieck's Early Romanticism . . .	444	Vos, B. J., and P. A. Barba, German Lyrics and Ballads,	
Tilley, M. P., A Neglected Six- teenth-century " <i>of—or</i> " Con- struction . . . . .	462		

	PAGE		PAGE
from Klopstock to Modern Times . . . . .	135	Wolfram's Relationship to the Crestien MSS. . . . .	520
Walpole, Horace, anticipates Victor Hugo....	458	Wordsworth's "Lucy" Poems, 314	
Walton . . . . .	534	Wörterbuch, Altfriesisches....	270
Watts, G. B., Notes on Voltaire . . . . .	118	— zum <i>Heland</i> .....	204
—, Was Dancourt a Plagi- arist? . . . . .	34	Wortkunde, Englische —. . .	471
Weber, Hauptmann's.....	242	Wright, C. H. C.: A. F. B. Clark, Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England (1660-1830) . . . . .	275
Weekley, E., A Concise Etymo- logical Dictionary of Modern English . . . . .	334	Wright, L. B., Notes on <i>Fulgens</i> and <i>Luercs</i> : New Light on the Interlude . . . . .	97
Wells, W., Spenser's Dragon .	143	—, Will Kemp and the <i>Com- media dell' arte</i> .....	516
Weltbild, Das hellenisch-deut- sche . . . . .	474	Wunder und Taten der Heili- gen . . . . .	545
Westgermanische Komposita... 188			
West Midland Dialect....	454	Young, K.: R. K. Root, The Book of <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> , by Geoffrey Chaucer.....	537
<i>Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre</i> and <i>Immensee</i> .....	513		
Wilkinson, Gen. James, in the Knickerbocker <i>History of</i> <i>New York</i> .....	353	Zeydel, E. H., A Note on Tieck's Early Romanticism . . . . .	444
Williams, R. C., The Merveil- leux in the Epic.....	550	Zimmermann, A., as a Source of Hauptmann's <i>Weber</i> ... .	242
Wilson, Robert.....	32	<i>Zitarie, Zitterie</i> , M. H. G....	43

## • RECENT PUBLICATIONS

### ENGLISH

- Ault, Norman (ed.).—Elizabethan Lyrics. *New York*: Longmans, 1925. Pp. 536.
- Beuse, J. F.—A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. Part I Aam-Dowel. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926. Pp. xxxii + 80.
- Bridges, Robert.—New Verse. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925. Pp. 39.
- Dexter, T. F. G.—Cornish Names. *London, New York*: Longmans, 1926. Pp. 90.
- Dunn, William P.—Sir Thomas Browne, a study in Religious Philosophy. *Menasha, Wis.*: Geo. Banta Co., 1926. Pp. 190.
- Fletcher, Harris.—Milton's Semitic Studies. *Chicago*: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1926. Pp. 155.
- Garrod, H. W.—Byron. 1824-1924. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1924. Pp. 22.
- Gilman, Margaret.—Othello in French. *Paris*: Champion, 1925. Pp. 197.
- Harrison, G. B. (ed.).—Willobie His Avis. Bodley Head Quartos XV. *New York*: Dutton, 1926. Pp. 271.
- Janney, F. Lamar.—Childhood in English Non-Dramatic Literature, from 1557 to 1798. *Greifswald*: Abel, 1925. Pp. 136.
- Manly, John M. (ed.).—English Prose and Poetry (Revised Edition). *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. Pp. xxxviii, 882.
- Meadowcroft, Charles William, Jr.—The Place of Eden Phillpotts in English Peasant Drama. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Pa., 1924. Pp. 120.
- Medwall, Henry.—Fulgens and Lucres. Edited by Boas, F. S. and Reed, A. W. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926. Pp. xxvii + 104.
- Morgan, Appleton.—Mrs. Shakespeare's Second Marriage. *New York*: The Shakespeare Society of N. Y., 1926. Pp. 63.
- Northup, Clark Sutherland with contributions by Joseph Quincy Adams and Andrew Keogh. Cornell Studies. A Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1925. Pp. 507.
- Parks, George Bruner.—The Forerunners of Hakluyt. *St. Louis*: Washington Univ. Studies, xiii, 335-370, 1926.
- Postma, J.—Tennyson, as seen by his Parodists. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1926. Pp. 199.
- Read, Edward Bliss (ed.).—Songs from the British Drama. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1925. Pp. 386.

Renwick, W. L.—Edmund Spenser—An Essay on Renaissance Poetry. *New York*: Longmans, 1925. Pp. 198.

Shakespeare, William.—Julius Caesar. Translated into Portuguese by Luis Cardim. *Porto*: Emp. Indust. Grafica, 1925. Pp. 283.

Smith, Lewis Worthington (ed.).—Current Reviews. *New York*: Holt, 1926. Pp. 388.

Spiller, Robert E.—The American in England, (during the First Half Century of Independence). *New York*: Holt, 1926. Pp. 416.

Thomas, J. M. Lloyd (ed.).—The Autobiography of Richard Baxter. *New York*: Dutton, 1925. Pp. xxxvii, 312. \$3.00.

Triebel, L. A. (ed.).—The Comedy of the Crocodile,—as preserved in various manuscripts. (A critical and historical introduction together with a Text of the Play, and other Addenda.) *Oxford*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925. Pp. 150.

Van Winkle, Cortlandt (ed.).—Epithalamium by Edmund Spenser. *New York*: F. S. Crofts, 1926. Pp. 144.

Vinciguerra, M.—Romantici e decadenti inglesi: Carlyle, Emerson, Poe, Wilde, Hardy, Stevenson, Moore, Synge, Vaughan. *Foligno*: F. Campitelli, 1926. 208 pp. L. 11.

Walker, Hugh.—English Satire and Satirists. *New York*: Dutton, 1925. Pp. 325.

Walpole, Horace.—A Selection from the Letters of, ed. W. S. Lewis. *New York*: Harpers, 1926. xxi + 478 pp. \$2.50.

Weaver, Charles P.—The Hermit in English Literature from its Beginnings to 1660. *Nashville, Tenn.*: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1924. Pp. 141.

Wilson, F. P. (ed.).—The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. xl, 268.

### GERMAN

Ancumanus, B. N.—Rosarium, dat is Rosen-Garden. Lateinische Epigramme John Owens in niederdeutscher Übersetzung (1638) hrsg. von Axel Lindquist. [Drucke des Ver. f. niederl. Sprachforschung. VII.] *Norden u. Leipzig*: H. Soltau, 1926. xxxvii, 168 pp. M. 5.

Bab, Julius.—Faust. Das Werk des Goetheschen Lebens. *Stuttgart*: Union [1926]. vii, 223 pp. Cloth, M. 6.

Beck, Christoph.—Die Ortsnamen des Aischtales und der Nachbartäler nebst Proben von Flurnamen u. e. Verz. d. Wüstungen. Mit 4 Kt. aus d. 17. u. 18. Jh. *Neustadt a. Aisch*: Ph. C. W. Schmidt, 1926. viii, 103 pp. M. 3.

Berendson, W. A.—Zur Methode der Reimuntersuchung im Streit um Goethes "Joseph." Entgegnung auf Friedr. Neumanns Aufsatz in d. Festschrift f. Ed. Sievers, 1925. *Hamburg*: W. Gente, 1926. 28 pp. M. 1.50.

Dulzer, Amélie.—Elisabeth Löns. Ein Frauenschicksal. 2. vollst. umgearb. u. erw. Aufl. *Minden i. W.*: W. Köhler. [1926]. 95 pp. Cloth, M. 3.50.

Eilers, Konrad.—Herman Löns als Charakter. [Beitr. z. niedersächs. Literaturgesch. Bd. 3]. *Hannover*: A. Sponholtz [1926]. 198 pp. M. 3.60.

Goeken, Walther.—Herder als Deutscher. Ein literarhist. Beitrag zur Entwicklung der deutschen Nationalidee. [Tübinger germanist. Arbeiten. Bd. 1]. *Stuttgart*: W. Kohlhammer, 1926. viii, 131 pp. M. 6.

Gutbier, Alex.—Goethe, Grossherzog Carl August u. die Chemie in Jena. Rede. Mit e. neu aufgefundenen Brief Döbereiners an Goethe, 3 Taf. u. 30 Anlagen. [Jenaer akad. Reden. H. 2]. *Jena*: G. Fischer, 1926. vi, 80 pp. M. 2.80.

Heess, Wilh.—Raabe. Seine Zeit u. s. Berufung. *Berlin-Grunewald*: H. Klemm [1926]. xiii, 216 pp. M. 4.50.

Hempel, Heinrich.—Nibelungenstudien. 1. Nibelungenlied Thidrikssaga und Balladen [German. Bibl. II. Abt. 22.] *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1926. x, 274 pp. M. 14.50.

Hochgesang, Michael.—Wandlungen des Dichtstils. Dargest. unter Zugrundelegung deutscher Macbeth-Übertragungen. *München*: M. Hueber, 1926. viii, 183 pp. M. 6.

Jacob, Gerhard.—Das Werk Thomas Manns. Bibliographie (bis zum 31. Dez. 1925.) *Berlin*: S. Fischer, 1926. 54 pp. M. 3.50.

Kahle, Carl.—Hermann Löns und die Frauen. *Minden i. W.*: W. Köhler [1926]. 117 pp. Cloth, M. 4.

Lessing, G. E.—Hamburgische Dramaturgie. I. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1926. vii, 80 pp. \$.50.

Mack, Eugen.—Goethe in der deutschen Nationalversammlung u. im Rechts- u. Staatsleben der Deutschen. *Wolfegg*: 1926. 40 pp. M. 1.

Odé, A. W. M.—Das schwache Präteritum in den Germanischen Sprachen. [Mededeelingen der K. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdel. Letterkunde, Deel 61, Ser. A, No. 6]. *Amsterdam*: 1926. 45 pp. Fl. 0.40.

Paulmann, Hans.—Müllners "Schuld" und ihre Wirkungen. [Diss. Münster, 1925.] *Weimar*: F. Fink, 1925. 280 pp. M. 10.

Regeln für die deutsche Rechtschreibung nebst Wörterverzeichnis. Neue Bearb. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1926. 59 pp. 20 Pf.

Sauer, Will.—Konradin im deutschen Drama. Eine literarhist. Abhandlung über 94 deutsche Konradindramen. *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1926. v, 132 pp. M. 5.

Wendell, Herm.—Heinrich Heine. Ein Lebens- u. Zeitbild. Neue Ausg. *Berlin*: Dietz Nf. 1926. xi, 308 pp., Cloth, M. 6.50.

Zuchhold, Hans.—Gustav Freytag. Ein Buch von deutschem Leben u. Wirken. *Breslau*: F. Goerlich [1926]. 78 pp. M. 1.20.

## FRENCH

Augier et Sandeau.—Le Gendre de M. Poirier, ed. C. S. Parker. *Boston*: Allyn & Bacon, 1926. xxxii + 239 pp. 80 cts.

Aveline, C.—Ouvrages de G. Duhamel, essai de bibliog. *Paris*: Aveline, 1925. 107 pp.

Bachelin, H.—J. K. Huysmans. 2e éd. *Paris*: Perrin, 1926. 304 pp. Fr. 9.

Bird, J. P.—Essentials of Fr. *New York*: Doubleday, 1925. x + 368 pp. \$1.50.

Bornier, H.—La fille de Roland, ed. C. A. Nelson. *New York*: Heath, 1925. viii + 136 pp. 80 cts.

Bourciez, E.—Précis hist. de phonétique fr. *Paris*: Klincksieck, 1926. xl + 319 pp. Fr. 18.

Braunschvig, M.—La litt. fr. contemporaine et dans les textes (1850-1925). *Paris*: A. Colin, 1926. xiv + 357 pp. Fr. 12.60.

Bruyère, Marcel.—Un poète chrétien au XIXe s., J. Reboul de Nîmes (1796-1864). *Paris*: Champion, 1925. 475 pp. Fr. 16.

Cardon, L.—Seconde Année moderne. *New York*: Scribner's, 1926. xii + 372 pp.

Capus, l'Esprit d'Alfred. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1926. 191 pp. Fr. 5.

Celarié, H.—Mme de Sévigné, sa famille et ses amis. *Paris*: Colin, 1925. 216 pp. Fr. 20.

Coppin, J.—Montaigne trad. de Raymond Sebon. *Paris* diss. *Lille*: Morel, 1926. 271 pp.

Cornilleau, R.—Balzac écrivain social. Pages choisies. *Paris*: Eds. Spes, 1926. xxviii + 224 pp. Fr. 4.25.

Courteault, P.—La Révolution et les théâtres à Bordeaux. *Paris*: Perrin, 1926. 287 pp. Fr. 15.

Danchin, A.—Une saison théâtrale à Lille. 1843-44. *Lille*: Raoust-Leleu, 1926. 94 pp.

Daudet, A.—Morceaux choisis, ed. F. W. Freeborn and N. Dubrule. *Boston*: Ginn, 1925. xii + 228 pp. 72 cts.